Book No.
938 F49 55g

Accession
96474

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
VITA SINE LITERIS MORS EST

Form 3431 30M 4-37

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 [illegible] 1099

DATE DUE

MAR 1 - 1982			
BFP!	FEB 26 '93		

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

GREECE UNDER THE ROMANS

THE PUBLISHERS OF *EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY* WILL BE PLEASED TO SEND FREELY TO ALL APPLICANTS A LIST OF THE PUBLISHED AND PROJECTED VOLUMES TO BE COMPRISED UNDER THE FOLLOWING TWELVE HEADINGS:

TRAVEL ❧ SCIENCE ❧ FICTION
THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
HISTORY ❧ CLASSICAL
CHILDREN'S BOOKS
ESSAYS ❧ ORATORY
POETRY & DRAMA
BIOGRAPHY
ROMANCE

IN TWO STYLES OF BINDING, CLOTH FLAT BACK COLOURED TOP AND LEATHER ROUND CORNERS GILT TOP.

LONDON: J. M. DENT & CO.

"CONSIDER HISTORY WITH THE BEGINNINGS OF IT STRETCHING DIMLY INTO THE REMOTE TIME; EMERGING DARKLY OUT OF THE MYSTERIOUS ETERNITY: THE TRUE EPIC POEM AND UNIVERSAL DIVINE SCRIPTURE. . . ."

CARLYLE

GREECE UNDER the ROMANS

BY GEORGE FINLAY LL.D.

LONDON: PUBLISHED
by J·M·DENT·&·CO
AND IN NEW YORK
BY E·P·DUTTON & CO

938
F+955g
96474

INTRODUCTION

'GEORGE FINLAY," said the late Dr. Richard Garnett, "was a great historian, of the type of Polybius, Procopius, and Machiavelli." He was a man-of-affairs before he was a man-of-letters: he qualified himself for writing history by helping to make it. He had fought for Greece, hoping, as he said, to aid in putting her on the high road "that leads to a rapid increase of production, population, and material improvement." He sacrificed his worldly chances to the cause of Greece in fact, with an enthusiasm not less than that of Lord Byron, whom he had met at Cephalonia in 1823. "I lost my money and my labour, but I learned how the system of tenths has produced a state of society and habits of cultivation, against which one man can do nothing. When I had wasted as much money as I possessed, I turned my attention to study." The first notable result of this intellectual step which was given to the world was the present volume, originally published in 1844. To resume his own account of his historical work: "I had planned," he says, "writing a true history of the Greek revolution in such a way as to exhibit the condition of the people. I wished to make it useful to those who come after us. It grew gradually into the *History of Greece under Foreign Domination* and the *History of the Greek Revolution.* I have hardly been more successful in my writings than in my farming. I fear I may say—

> I am one the more
> To baffled millions who have gone before."

There is no doubt that towards the end of his career Finlay was inclined to depreciate the value of his contribution both to the history and the cause of Greece. However, exception has been taken by some of those who knew him intimately, to the idea that this was produced by anything like settled melancholy or lasting disappointment: if the graver feeling was latterly to be traced in him, it was due to failing health and to the loss of a favourite daughter.

George Finlay came of good Scottish stock, was the grandson

of a Glasgow merchant, and the son of Captain John Finlay R.E., F.R.S. He was born at Faversham, Kent, 21 Decembe 1799, and educated under private tutors at home before goin to the University of Gottingen. His uncle, Kirkman Finlay, wa Lord Provost of Glasgow; and his brother of the same nam went, like him, to Greece, fought under her flag, and was shot fighting before the fortress of Scio, 29 January, 1828. Georg Finlay died at Athens 26 January, 1875.

The following is his list of published works :—

The Hellenic Kingdom and the Greek Nation, 1836. *Remark on the Topography of Oropia and Diacria*, 1838. Ἐπιστολη προ τους Ἀθηναιους (and other pamphlets on Greek Finance), 1844 *Greece under the Romans*, 1844. *On the Site of the Holy Sepul chre*, 1847. *Greece to its Conquest by the Turks*, 1851. *Greec under Ottoman and Venetian Dominion*, 1856. *The Greek Revolution*, 1861. *Objects found in Greece, in the collection of G. F* Ἀντικειμενα εὑρεθεντα ἐν Ἑλλαδι, 1869. *The French Narrative of Benjamin Brue*, 1870. *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time*, B.C. 146–A.D. 1864; 1877 [Clarendon Press reissue of his History, revised by himself, and edited by Tozer].

Finlay also contributed to the "Times" (1864–70), "Athenæum," and "Saturday Review."

TO JAMES MACGREGOR, ESQ., M.P.

My dear James,

I dedicate to you this History of Greece under Foreign Domination.

Your encouragement often cheered me to prosecute the work when my literary deficiencies suggested doubts whether, in my hands, it could be of any use.

Had the hopes with which I joined the cause of Greece in 1823 been fulfilled, it is not probable that I should have abandoned the active duties of life, and the noble task of labouring to improve the land, for the sterile occupation of recording its misfortunes. But the demerits of my literary efforts, in the cause of civil liberty and national institutions, will not, I am sure, diminish your affection for the Author; and though this page is a trifling proof of gratitude, you will receive it with pleasure, as a testimony of the sincere friendship of

Your affectionate Brother,

GEORGE FINLAY.

Athens, 12*th November*, 1856.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface to the History of Greece under Foreign Domination . . 7
Preface to Greece under the Romans 11
Chronology 13

CHAPTER I

FROM THE CONQUEST OF GREECE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTANTINOPLE AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. B.C. 146–A.D. 330

Introduction—Changes produced by the conquests of Alexander the Great on the condition of the Greek nation . . . 23
SECT. I. Immediate causes of the conquest of Greece by the Romans 37
II. Treatment of Greece after its conquest 41
III. Effects of the Mithridatic war on the state of Greece . 45
IV. Ruin of the country by the pirates of Cilicia . . . 47
V. Nature of the Roman provincial administration in Greece . 51
VI. Fiscal administration of the Romans 57
VII. Depopulation of Greece caused by the Roman government 66
VIII. Roman colonies established in Greece 72
IX. Political condition of Greece from the time of Augustus to that of Caracalla 75
X. The Greeks and Romans never showed any disposition to unite and form one people 81
XI. State of society among the Greeks 86
XII. Influence of religion and philosophy on society . . . 94
XIII. The social condition of the Greeks affected by the want of colonies of emigration 99
XIV. Effects produced in Greece by the inroads of the Goths . 102
XV. Changes which preceded the establishment of Constantinople as the capital of the Roman empire 110

CHAPTER II

FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTANTINOPLE AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, TO THE ACCESSION OF JUSTINIAN. A.D. 330–527

SECT. I. Constantine, in reforming the government of the Roman empire, placed the administration in direct hostility to the people 113
II. The condition of the Greeks was not improved by Constantine's reforms 124

SECT. PAGE

III. Changes produced in the social condition of the Greeks by the alliance of Christianity with their national manners 129
IV. The Orthodox Church became identified with the Greek nation 141
V. Condition of the Greek population of the empire from the reign of Constantine to that of Theodosius the Great . 146
VI. Communications of the Greeks with countries beyond the bounds of the Roman empire 151
VII. Effect of the separation of the Eastern and Western Empires on the Greek nation, A.D. 395 154
VIII. Attempts of the Goths to establish themselves in Greece . 161
IX. The Greeks arrested the conquests of the northern barbarians 168
X. Declining condition of the Greek population in the European provinces of the Eastern Empire 174
XI. Improvement in the Eastern Empire from the death of Arcadius to the accession of Justinian 177
XII. State of civilisation, and influence of national feelings, during this period 190

CHAPTER III

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS UNDER THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN. A.D. 527–565

SECT. I. Influence of the imperial power on the condition of the Greek nation during the reign of Justinian . . . 197
II. Military forces of the empire 206
III. Influence of Justinian's legislation on the Greek population 215
IV. Internal administration, as it affected the Greeks . . 219
V. Influence of Justinian's conquests on the Greek population, and the change effected by the conquest of the Vandal kingdom of Africa 229
VI. Causes of the easy conquest of the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy by Belisarius 236
VII. Relations of the northern nations with the Roman empire and the Greek nation . . . . . .
VIII. Relations of the Roman empire with Persia . . . .
IX. Commercial position of the Greeks, and comparison with the other nations living under the Roman government . 2
X. Influence of the Orthodox Church on the national feelings of the Greeks 2
XI. State of Athens during the decline of paganism, and until the extinction of its schools by Justinian . . . 2

CHAPTER IV

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE DEATH OF JUSTINIAN TO THE RESTORATION OF ROMAN POWER IN THE EAST BY HERACLIUS. A.D. 565–633

		PAGE
SECT. I.	The reign of Justin II.	286
II.	Disorganisation of all political and national influence during the reigns of Tiberius II. and Maurice	295
III.	Maurice causes a revolution by attempting to re-establish the ancient authority of the imperial administration	299
IV.	Phocas was the representative of a revolution, not of a national party	305
V.	The empire under Heraclius	308
VI.	Change in the position of the Greek population produced by the Sclavonic establishments in Dalmatia	325
VII.	Influence of the campaigns of Heraclius in the East	335
VIII.	Condition of the native population of Greece	344

CHAPTER V

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE MOHAMMEDAN INVASION OF SYRIA TO THE EXTINCTION OF THE ROMAN POWER IN THE EAST. A.D. 633–716

SECT. I.	The Roman empire gradually changed into the Byzantine	348
II.	Conquest of the southern provinces of the empire, of which the majority of the population was not Greek nor orthodox	352
III.	Constans II. followed the policy of Heraclius	369
IV.	Constantine IV. yielded to the popular ecclesiastical party among the Greeks	375
V.	Depopulation of the empire, and decrease of the Greeks, under Justinian II.	380
VI.	Anarchy in the administration until the accession of Leo III.	386
VII.	General view of the condition of the Greeks at the extinction of the Roman power in the East	392

APPENDIX

I.	On the Blindness of Belisarius	417
II.	On Roman and Byzantine Money	419
III.	On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre	438
IV.	Catalogue of the edition of the Byzantine historians printed at Paris and reprinted at Venice, with the additions required to complete it	456
INDEX		463

PREFACE

THE history of Greece under foreign domination records the degradation and the calamities of the nation which attained the highest degree of civilisation in the ancient world. Two thousand years of suffering have not obliterated the national character, nor extinguished the national ambition. In order to compress an account of the vicissitudes in the condition of Greece, during this long period, within the space of five volumes, it has been necessary to confine the attention of the reader to the political state of the nation, without entering into details concerning the general history of the foreign conquerors. This plan has perhaps circumscribed the interest of the work. The history of enslaved Greece has hitherto been neglected, because it was supposed to offer little instruction to the patriot and the scholar; but it deserves to be attentively studied by the statesman and the political economist, for under the government of the Byzantine emperors it affords an instructive example of the great power that scientific administrative arrangements exert on the political existence and material prosperity of a nation, even when the government is neither supported by popular sympathies, nor invigorated by the impulse of national progress. At the present time, more especially, when the European monarchies are centralising all the powers of government, and separating the feelings and interests of the administration from the sympathies and prosperity of the people, the history of the Byzantine empire offers a solemn warning to sovereigns, and the national degradation of the Greek people presents an instructive picture to their subjects. Despotism has a powerful agent in administrative centralisation, and two strong camps in political servility and popular anarchy.

The records of enslaved Greece are as much a portion of her national existence as her heroic poetry and her classic history. The people who sent out a hundred colonies, and who fought at Salamis and Platea, were the ancestors of the men who fled before the Romans, and who yielded up their own land to be peopled by Sclavonians and Albanians. The ancient Greeks purchased foreign slaves to labour in their fields, the modern Greeks delivered up their own children to form the janissaries, who held them in a

state of slavery. The modern Greeks turn with aversion from the study of their own history. They take no interest in the fortunes of their ancestors, but they claim an imaginary genealogy to connect their national existence with the extinct races of privileged aristocratic tribes, whose existence ceased as Paganism expired. Indeed, the lineal descendants of the Spartans, and of the original citizens of Solon's Athens, did not survive the Roman conquest. The rich inheritance of the intellectual wealth of Greece was divided with Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, while Greece still retained its independence. In order to acquire political knowledge, the present race of Greeks must study their history as a subject people. More practical information is to be gained by an examination of the effects of their communal institutions under the Othomans, than by unravelling the signification of impure fables and obscure myths. They can only trace their connection with the Hellenes through the records of twenty centuries of national or political slavery. If they emulate the patriotism of the ancient Greeks, and rival their eminence in literature and art, all Europe will readily admit their claims to the purest Hellenic genealogy. National vanity has for the present so completely vitiated public opinion at Athens, that an English writer may expect more readers than a Greek. To those who are familiar with the works of Grote, it may not be uninteresting to know something of the political changes which degraded the social civilisation of Greece. The history of a people which preserved its language and its nationality through centuries of misfortune, and whose energy has so far revived as to form an independent State, ought not to be utterly neglected.

The condition of Greece during its long period of servitude was not one of uniform degeneracy. Under the Romans, and subsequently under the Othomans, the Greeks formed only an insignificant portion of a vast empire. Their unwarlike character rendered them of little political importance, and many of the great changes and revolutions which occurred in the dominions of the emperors and of the sultans, exerted no direct influence on Greece. Consequently, neither the general history of the Roman nor of the Othoman empire forms a portion of Greek history. Under th Byzantine emperors the case was different; the Greeks becam then identified with the imperial administration. The dissimilarity in the political position of the nation during these periods requires a different treatment from the historian to explain the characteristics of the times.

The changes which affected the political and social condition of the Greeks divide their history, as a subject people, into six distinct periods.

1. The first of these periods comprises the history of Greece under the Roman government. The physical and moral degradation of the people deprived them of all political influence, until Greek society was at length regenerated by the Christian religion. After Christianity became the religion of the Roman emperors, the predominant power of the Greek clergy, in the ecclesiastical establishment of the Eastern Empire, restored to the Greeks some degree of influence in the government, and gave them a degree of social authority over human civilisation in the East, which rivalled that which they had formerly obtained by the Macedonian conquests. In the portion of this work devoted to the condition of Greece under the Romans, the Author has confined his attention exclusively to the condition of the people, and to those branches of the Roman administration which affected their condition. The predominant influence of Roman feelings and prejudices in the Eastern Empire terminates with the accession of Leo the Isaurian, who gave the administration at Constantinople a new character.

2. The second period embraces the history of the Eastern Roman Empire in its new form, under its conventional title of the Byzantine Empire. The records of this despotism, modified, renovated, and reinvigorated by the Iconoclast emperors, constitute one of the most remarkable and instructive lessons in the history of monarchical institutions. They teach us that a well-organised central government can with ease hold many subject nations in a state of political nullity. During this period, the history of the Greeks is closely interwoven with the annals of the Imperial government, so that the history of the Byzantine Empire forms a portion of the history of the Greek nation. Byzantine history extends from the accession of Leo the Isaurian, in the year 716, to the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204.

3. After the destruction of the Eastern Roman Empire, Greek history diverges into many channels. The exiled Roman-Greeks of Constantinople fled to Asia, and established their capital at Nicæa; they prolonged the Imperial administration in some provinces on the old model and with the old names. After the lapse of less than sixty years, they recovered possession of Constantinople; but though the government they exercised retained the proud title of the Roman Empire, it was only a degenerate representative even of the Byzantine state. This third period is

characterised as the Greek Empire of Constantinople. Its feeble existence was terminated by the Othoman Turks at the taking of Constantinople in 1453.

4. When the Crusaders conquered the greater part of the Byzantine Empire, they divided their conquests with the Venetians, and founded the Latin Empire of Romania, with its feudal principalities in Greece. The domination of the Latins is important, as marking the decline of Greek influence in the East, and as causing a rapid diminution in the wealth and numbers of the Greek nation. This period extends from the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, until the conquest of Naxos by the Othoman Turks in 1566.

5. The conquest of Constantinople in 1204 caused the foundation of a new Greek state in the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire, called the Empire of Trebizond. Its existence is a curious episode in Greek history, though the government was characterised by peculiarities which indicated the influence of Asiatic rather than of European manners. It bore a strong resemblance to the Iberian and Armenian monarchies. During two centuries and a half, it maintained a considerable degree of influence, based, however, rather on its commercial position and resources than on its political strength or its Greek civilisation. Its existence exerted little influence on the fate or fortunes of Greece, and its conquest, in the year 1461, excited little sympathy.

6. The sixth and last period of the history of Greece under foreign domination extends from 1453 to 1821, and embraces the records both of the Othoman rule and of the temporary occupation of the Peloponnesus by the Venetian Republic, from 1685 to 1715. Nations have, perhaps, perpetuated their existence in an equally degraded position; but history offers no other example of a nation which had sunk to such a state of debasement making a successful effort to recover its independence.

The object of this work is to lay before the reader those leading facts that are required to enable him to estimate correctly the political condition of the Greek nation under its different masters; not to collect all the materials necessary to form a complete history of Greece under foreign domination. The ecclesiastical and literary records are consequently only noticed with reference to political history. A complete history of the modern Greeks might, perhaps, be rendered both instructive and interesting to Greeks, but it would be difficult to render it attractive to foreigners.

ATHENS, 21*st December*, 1855.

PREFACE TO GREECE UNDER THE ROMANS

THE social and political organisation of life among the Greeks and Romans was essentially different, even during the period when they were subject to the same government; and this difference must be impressed on the mind, before the relative state of civilisation in the Eastern and Western Empires can be thoroughly understood.

The Romans were a tribe of warriors. All their institutions, even those relating to property and agriculture, were formed with reference to war. The people of the Western Empire, including the greater part of Italy, consisted of a variety of races, who were either in a low state of civilisation at the time of their conquest by the Romans, or else had been already subjected to foreigners. They were generally treated as inferior beings, and the framework of their national institutions was everywhere destroyed. The provincials of the West, when thus left destitute of every bond of national union, were exposed to the invasions of warlike tribes, which, under the first impulses of civilisation, were driven on to seek the means of supplying new wants. The moment, therefore, that the military forces of the Roman government were unable to repulse these strangers, the population of the provinces was exposed to subjection, slavery, or extermination, according as the interests or the policy of the invading barbarians might determine.

In that portion of the Eastern Empire peopled by the Greeks, the case was totally different. There the executive power of the Roman government was modified by a system of national institutions, which conferred, even on the rural population, some control over their local affairs. The sovereign authority was relieved from that petty sphere of administration and police, which meddles with the daily occupations of the people. The Romans found this branch of government completely organised, in a manner not closely connected with the political sovereignty; and though the local institutions of the Greeks proved less powerful than the central despotism of their conquerors, they possessed greater vitality. Their nationality continued to exist even after their conquest; and this nationality was again called into activity when the Roman government, from increasing weakness, gradually began to neglect the duties of administration.

But while the conquest of Greece by the Romans had indeed

left the national existence nearly unaltered, time, as it changed the government of Rome, modified likewise the institutions of the Greeks. Still, neither the Roman Cæsars, nor the Byzantine emperors, any more than the Frank princes and Turkish sultans, were able to interrupt the continual transmission of a political inheritance by each generation of the Greek race to its successors; though it is too true that, from age to age, the value of that inheritance was gradually diminished, until in our own times a noble impulse and a desperate struggle restored to the people its political existence.

The history of the Greek nation, even as a subject people, cannot be destitute of interest and instruction. The Greeks are the only existing representatives of the ancient world. They have maintained possession of their country, their language, and their social organisation, against physical and moral forces, which have swept from the face of the earth all their early contemporaries, friends, and enemies. It can hardly be disputed that the preservation of their national existence is to be partly attributed to the institutions which they have received from their ancestors. The work now offered to the public attempts to trace the effects of the ancient institutions on the fortunes of the people under the Roman government, and endeavours to show in what manner those institutions were modified or supported by other circumstances.

It was impossible, in the following pages, to omit treating of events already illustrated by the genius of Gibbon. But these events must be viewed by the historian of the Roman Empire, and of the Greek people, under very different aspects. The observations of both may be equally true, though inferior skill and judgment may render the views, in the present work, less correct as a picture, and less impressive as a history. The same facts afford innumerable conclusions to different individuals, and in different ages. History will ever remain inexhaustible; and much as we have read of the Greeks and Romans, and deeply as we appear to have studied their records, there is much still to be learned from the same sources.

In the references to the authorities followed in this work, a preference will often be shown to those modern treatises, which ought to be in the hands of the general reader. It has often required profound investigation and long discussion to elicit a fact now generally known, or to settle an opinion now universally adopted, and in such cases it would be useless to collect a long array of ancient passages.

1*st May*, 1843.

CHRONOLOGY

B.C.

323. Death of Alexander. Lamian war.
322. Antipater disfranchised 12,000 Athenian citizens.—Plutarch; "Phocion," 28.
321. Ptolemy founds a monarchy in Egypt.
312. Era of Seleucidæ.
310. Agathocles invades Carthaginian possessions in Africa.
303. Demetrius Poliorcetes raises siege of Rhodes.
300. Mithridates Ariobarzanes founds kingdom of Pontus.
280. Achaian league commenced.
Pyrrhus landed in Italy to defend the Greeks against the Romans.
279. Gauls invade Greece, and are repulsed at Delphi.
278. Nicomedes brings the Gauls into Asia.
271. Romans complete the conquest of Magna Græcia.
260. Romans prepare their first fleet to contend with Carthage.
250. Parthian monarchy founded by Arsaces.
241. Attalus, king of Pergamus.
228. First Roman embassy to Greece.—Polybius, ii. 12.
218. Hannibal invades Italy.
212. Syracuse taken by Romans. Sicily conquered.
210 Sicily reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
202. Battle of Zama.
197. Battle of Cynoscephalæ.
196. The Greeks declared free by Flamininus at the Isthmian games.
192. Antiochus the Great invaded Greece.
188. The laws of Lycurgus abrogated by Philopœmen.
181. Death of Hannibal.
168. Battle of Pydna. End of Macedonian monarchy.
167. One thousand Achaian citizens sent as hostages to Rome.
155. The fine of 500 talents imposed on Athens for plundering the Oropians remitted by the Romans.
147. Macedonia reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
146. Corinth taken by Mummius. Greece reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
133. Rebellion of slaves in the Attic silver mines.
130. Asia, embracing great part of the country between the Halys and Mount Taurus, constituted a Roman province.
96. Cyrenaïca became a Roman possession by the will of Ptolemy Apion.
86. Athens taken by Sylla.
77. Depredations of the pirates on the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor at their acme.
75. Bithynia and Pontus constituted a Roman province.
67. Crete conquered by Metellus after a war of two years and a half, and shortly after reduced to the condition of a Roman province. It was subsequently united with Cyrenaïca.
66. Monarchy of the Seleucidæ conquered by Pompey.
65. Cilicia reduced to the condition of a Roman province.

B.C.

48. Cæsar destroyed Megara.
44. Cæsar founded a Roman colony at Corinth.
30. Augustus founded Nicopolis.
Egypt reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
25. Galatia and Lycaonia constituted a Roman province.
24. Pamphylia and Lycia constituted a Roman province.
21. Cyprus reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
Athens deprived of its jurisdiction over Eretria and Ægina, and the confederacy of the free Laconian cities formed by Augustus.
14. Augustus establishes a Roman colony at Patras.

A.D. Year of Rome 753. 194th Olympiad, 4th year, A.M. 5508 of the Byzantines, called the Era of Constantinople; but other calculations were adopted at Alexandria and Antioch. See *l'Art de vérifier les Dates depuis la naissance de Jésus-Christ*, and *Ideler Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie.*
18. Cappadocia reduced to the condition of a Roman province.
22. The Roman senate restricted the right of asylum claimed by the Greek temples and sanctuaries.
66. Nero in Greece.
67. Nero celebrates the Olympic games.
72. Commagene reduced to a Roman province.—Clinton, *Fasti Romani.*
73. Thrace reduced to a Roman province by Vespasian.
Rhodes, Samos, and other islands on the coast of Asia deprived of their privileges as free states, and reduced to the condition of a Roman province called the Islands.
74. Vespasian expels the philosophers from Rome.
90. Domitian expels the philosophers from Rome.
96. Apollonius of Tyana at Ephesus at the time of Domitian's death.
98. Plutarch flourished.
103. Epictetus taught at Nicopolis. Arrian heard his lessons.
112. Hadrian, archon of Athens.
115. Martyrdom of Ignatius.
122. Hadrian visits Athens.
125. Hadrian again at Athens.
129. Hadrian passes the winter at Athens.
132. Jewish war.
135. Hadrian is at Athens towards the close of the Jewish war.
143. Herodes Atticus consul.
162. Galen at Rome. Pausanias, Polyænus, Lucian, and Ptolemy flourished.
168. Disgrace of Herodes Atticus at Sirmium.
176. Marcus Aurelius visits Athens and establishes scholarchs of the four great philosophic sects.
180. Dio Cassius, Herodian, Athenæus flourished.
212. Edict of Caracalla, conferring the Roman citizenship on all the free inhabitants of the empire.
226. Artaxerxes overthrows the Parthian empire of the Arsacides, and founds the Persian monarchy of the Sassanides.
238. Herodian, Ælian, Philostratus.
251. The emperor Decius defeated and slain by the Goths.
267. Athens taken by the Goths.—Dexippus.
284. Era of Diocletian, called Era of the Martyrs.

A.D.

312. 1st September. Cycle of Indictions of Constantine.
325. Council of Nicæa.
330. Dedication of CONSTANTINOPLE.
332. Cherson assists Constantine against the Goths.
337. Constantine II., CONSTANTIUS, Constans, emperors.
355. Julian appointed Cæsar.
361. JULIAN.
363. JOVIAN.
364. Valentinian I. VALENS.
365. Earthquake in Greece, Asia Minor, and Sicily.—Amm. Marcell. xxvi. 10.
375. Earthquake felt especially in Peloponnesus.—Zosimus, iv. 18.
Gratian emperor.
378. Defeat and death of Valens.
379. THEODOSIUS the Great.
381. Second œcumenical council. Constantinople.
394. Olympic games abolished.—Cedrenus, i. 326.
395. ARCADIUS and Honorius. Huns ravage Asia Minor. Alario invades Greece.
398. Alaric governor of Eastern Illyricum.
408. Theodosius II.
425. University of Constantinople organised.
428. Genseric invades Africa.
431. Third œcumenical council. Ephesus.
438. Publication of the Theodosian Code.
439. Genseric takes Carthage.
441. Theodosius II. sends a fleet against Genseric.
442. Attila invades Thrace and Macedonia.
447. Attila ravages the country of Thermopylæ.
Walls of Constantinople repaired by Theodosius II.
449. Council of Ephesus, called the Council of Brigands.
450. MARCIAN.
451. Fourth œcumenical council. Chalcedon.
457. LEO I., called the Great, and the Butcher.
458. Great earthquake felt from Antioch to Thrace.
460. Earthquake at Cyzicus.
465. Fire which destroyed parts of eight of the sixteen quarters of Constantinople.
468. Leo I. sends a great expedition against Genseric.
473. Leo II. crowned.
474. LEO II. ZENO the Isaurian.
476. End of the Western Roman Empire.
477. Return of Zeno, twenty months after he had been driven from Constantinople by Basiliskos.
480. Earthquakes at Constantinople during forty days.
Statue of Theodosius the Great thrown from its column.
491. ANASTASIUS I., called Dicorus.
499. Bulgarians invade the empire.
507. Anastasius constructs the long wall of Thrace.
514. Revolt of Vitalianus.
518. JUSTIN I.
526. Death of Theodoric.
527. JUSTINIAN I.

A.D.

Gretes, king of the Huns, receives baptism at Constantinople. The Tzans submit to the Roman empire.

528. Gordas, king of the Huns, on the Cimmerian Bosphorus, receives baptism at Constantinople, and is murdered by his subjects on his return.

Justinian commences his lavish expenditure on fortifications and public buildings.

529. First edition of the Code of Justinian.
Schools of philosophy at Athens closed.

531. Battle of Callinicum. Death of Kobad, king of Persia.
Plague commenced which ravaged the Roman empire for fifty years.

532. Sedition of Nika.
Peace concluded with Chosroes.

533. Conquest of the Vandal kingdom in Africa.
Institutions and Pandects published.

534. Belisarius returns to Constantinople.
Second edition of the Code.

536. Belisarius takes Rome.

537. Siege of Rome by Goths under Witiges.
Dedication of St. Sophia's.

538. Bulgarians invade the empire.
Famine in Italy.

539. Witiges besieged in Ravenna.
Huns plunder Greece to the isthmus of Corinth.—Procopius, *Pers.* ii. 4.

540. Surrender of Ravenna.—Marini Papiri, 336. Savigny, *Geschichte des Romeischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, i. 347.
Chosroes invades Syria. Sack of Antioch.

541. Totila king of the Goths.
Consulate abolished by Justinian.

542. Great pestilence at Constantinople.

546. Rome taken by Totila.

547. Rome taken by Belisarius.

548. Belisarius quits Italy.
Death of Theodora.

549. Rome again taken by Totila.
Justinian's armies occupy the country of the Lazi.

550. Sclavonians and Huns invade the empire.

551. Silkworm introduced into the Roman Empire.

552. Totila defeated. Rome retaken by Narses.

553. Fifth œcumenical council. Constantinople.

554. Earthquakes at Constantinople, Nicomedia, Berytus, and Cos. Church of Cyzicus fell during divine service.

557. Terrible earthquake at Constantinople. Justinian did not wear his crown for forty days.—Agathias, 145; Malalas, xviii. 233.

558. Zabergan, king of the Huns, defeated near Constantinople by Belisarius.

562. Treaty of peace with Persia. Belisarius accused of treason.

563. Belisarius restored to his rank.

565. March—death of Belisarius.
13th Nov.—death of Justinian in the thirty-ninth year of his reign.
JUSTIN II.

567. Kingdom of Gepids destroyed by Lombards.

A.D.

568. Lombards invade Italy.
569. Justin sends the embassy of Zemarchos to the Turks.
571. Mahomet born. Weil (*Mohammed sein Leben und seine Lehre*, 21) says he died in 632, at the age of 63 lunar years, which places his birth in April 571. Silvestre de Sacy says 20th or 21st April. See also Sprenger's *Life of Mohammed*, 75.
572. War between the Roman empire and Persia.
574. Tiberius defeated by the Avars.
Tiberius proclaimed Cæsar by Justin.
576. Battle of Melitene. Romans penetrate to Caspian Sea.
578. Death of Justin II. TIBERIUS II.
579. Death of Chosroes.
581. Persian army defeated by Maurice in his fourth campaign.
582. 14th Aug.—Death of Tiberius. MAURICE.
John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, uses the title Œcumenic, granted to the patriarch by Justinian.
589. Incursions of the Avars and Sclavonians into Greece.—Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 10. From this time Sclavonian colonies were settled in the Peloponnesus.
590. Maurice crowns his son Theodosius at Easter. Hormisdas, king of Persia, dethroned and murdered.
591. Chosroes II. restored to the Persian throne by the assistance of Maurice.
Maurice marches out of Constantinople against the Avars.
600. Maurice fails to ransom the Roman prisoners.
602. Rebellion of the army. PHOCAS proclaimed emperor.
603. Persian war commences.
608. Priscus, the son-in-law of Phocas, invites Heraclius.
609. Persians lay waste Asia Minor, and reach Chalcedon.
610. Phocas slain. HERACLIUS.
613. Heraclius Constantine, or Constantine III., crowned 22nd Jan.; he was born 3rd May, 612.
614. Jerusalem taken by the Persians, and Church of the Holy Sepulchre burned.
615. Heraclius sends the patrician Niketas to seize the wealth of John the Charitable, patriarch of Alexandria.
616. Persians invade Egypt.
617. Persians occupy Chalcedon with a garrison.
618. Public distributions of bread at Constantinople commuted for a payment in money preparatory to its abolition.
619. Avars attempt to seize Heraclius at a conference for peace.
620. Peace concluded with the Avars.
621. Great preparations for carrying on the Persian war.
622. Monday, 5th April—Heraclius left Constantinople and proceeded by sea to Pylæ. He collected troops from the provinces, and exercised his army. He advanced to the frontiers of Armenia, and made dispositions to winter in Pontus, but suddenly advanced through Armenia into Persia. The Persians made a diversion against Cilicia, but, on Heraclius continuing his advance, turned and pursued him. Heraclius gained a battle, and placed his army in winter quarters in Armenia. 16th July—Era of the Hegira of Mahomet.
623. 25th March—Heraclius left Constantinople, joined the army in

A.D.

Armenia, and was in the Persian territory by the 20th April. Chosroes rejects terms of peace, and Heraclius takes Ganzaca and Thebarmes. Chosroes fled by the passes into Media, and Heraclius retired to winter in Albania.

Death of Sisebut, king of the Visigoths, who had conquered the Roman possessions in Spain.

624. Chosroes sends an army, under Sarablagas and Perozites, to guard the passes by which Heraclius was likely to invade Persia; but the emperor, making a long circuit by the plains, engaged Sarablagas before he was joined by Sarbaraza, and gained the battle. Sarbaraza, and then Saen, are also defeated. The Lazes and Abasges abandoned Heraclius in this campaign. Heraclius wintered in the Persian territory. This was a campaign of marches and counter-marches in a mountainous country, and Heraclius was opposed by greatly superior forces, who succeeded in preventing his advance into Persia.

625. Heraclius resolves to return into the south-eastern part of Asia Minor. From his winter quarters there were two roads—a short mountain-road by Taranton, where nothing could be found for the troops; a longer road, by the passes of Mount Taurus, where supplies could be obtained. After a difficult march of seven days over Taurus, Heraclius crossed the Tigris, marched by Martyropolis to Amida, where he rested, and despatched a courier to Constantinople. As the Persians were following, Heraclius placed guards in the passes, crossed the Nymphius, and reached the Euphrates, where he found the bridge of boats withdrawn. He crossed by a ford, and passed by Samosata over Mount Taurus to Germanicia and Adana, where he encamped between the city and the bridge over the Saros. Sarbaraza advances to the Saros, and, after a battle, retires. Heraclius advances to Sebaste, crosses the Halys, and puts his army into winter quarters.

Chosroes plunders the Christian churches in Persia, and compels all Christians in his dominions to profess themselves Nestorians.

626. The scholarians make a tumult at Constantinople because they are deprived of the bread which had previously been distributed. John Seismos attempts to raise the price of bread from three to eight pholles.

Constantinople besieged by the Avars from 29th July to 8th August.

A Persian army under Sarbaraza occupies Chalcedon. Another under Saen is defeated by Theodore, the emperor's brother. Heraclius stations himself in Lazica, and waits until he is assured of the defeat of the Avars before Constantinople, and the passage of the Caspian gates by an army of Khazars under Ziebel. Meeting of Heraclius and Ziebel took place near Tiflis, which was occupied by a Persian garrison. The Khazars furnish Heraclius with 40,000 troops.

The church of Blachernes is enclosed within the fortifications of the city by a new wall.

627. Heraclius appears to have derived little advantage from the assistance of the 40,000 Khazars, unless we suppose that by their assistance he was able to render himself master of Persarmenia and Atropatene. They quitted him during the year 627. 9th October—Heraclius entered the district of Chamaetha, where he remained

A.D.

seven days. 1st December—Heraclius reached the greater Zab, crossed and encamped near Nineveh. Rhazetas quitted his station at Ganzaca, and pursued Heraclius—crossed the greater Zab by a ford three miles lower down than Heraclius passed it. Battle in which Rhazetes was defeated on Saturday, 12th December. Sarbaraza recalled from Chalcedon to oppose the advance of Heraclius, who occupied Nineveh, and passed the greater Zab again. 23rd December—Heraclius passed the lesser Zab, and rested several days in the palace of Jesdem, where he celebrated Christmas.

628. 1st January—Heraclius passed the river Torna, took the palace of Beglali with its parks, and Dastagerd, where Chosroes had resided for twenty-four years, and accumulated great treasures. Heraclius recovered three hundred standards taken by the Persians from the Romans at different times, and passed the feast of Epiphany (6th January) at Dastagerd. He quitted Dastagerd on the 7th, and in three days reached the neighbourhood of Ctesiphon, and encamped twelve miles from the Arba, which he found was not fordable. He then ascended the Arba to Siazouron, and spent the month of February in that country. In March he spent seven days at Varzan, where he received news of the revolution which had taken place, and that Siroes had dethroned his father. Heraclius then retired from the neighbourhood of Ctesiphon by Siarzoura, Chalchas, Jesdem. He passed mount Zara (Zagros), where there was a great fall of snow during the month of March, and encamped near Ganzaca, which had then three thousand houses.

3rd April—An ambassador of Siroes arrived at the camp of Heraclius. Peace concluded. 8th April—Heraclius quitted his camp at Ganzaca. 15th May—His letters announcing peace were read in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople.

629. Death of Siroes, or Kabad, succeeded by his son Ardeshir.
Heraclius visits Jerusalem, and restores the Holy Cross to the keeping of the patriarch.

630. Heraclius at Hierapolis occupied with ecclesiastical reforms.

632. Death of Mahomet, 7th or 8th June.
Era of Yesdedjerd, 15th August.

633. The chronology of the Saracen campaigns in Syria is extremely uncertain. The accounts of the Greek and Arabian writers require to be adjusted by the sequence of a few events which can be fixed with accuracy. There are several excellent observations on the subject in Weil's notes to his *Geschichte der Chalifen*, and I have often preferred his authority to that of Pagi and Clinton. Wakidi, who is received as the best authority by Ockley, Gibbon, and Clinton, is now considered by orientalists as furnishing materials for romance rather than for history.—Weil, i. 39, note 3.
Bosra besieged, and perhaps it was taken early in the following year.
Abubekr was occupied, for some time after the death of Mahomet, in reducing the rebellious Arabs to submission, and in subduing several false prophets.

634. 30th July—Battle of Adjnadin. Concerning its position, see Weil, i. 40, note 1.
22nd August—Death of Abubekr.
September—Battle of Yermuk (Hieromax). Omar was already proclaimed caliph in the Syrian army.

A.D.

635. Damascus taken after a siege of several months. The siege commenced after the battle of Yermuk.—See the correction of Theophanes in Weil, i. 48 note.
Heraclius, taking the Holy Cross with him, quitted Syria, and retired to Constantinople.

636. Various towns on the sea-coast taken by the Saracens, and another battle fought.
Vahan, the commander of the Roman army, appears to have been proclaimed emperor in this or the preceding year.—Theophanes, 280, edit. Par.

637. Capitulation of Jerusalem. The date of Omar's entry into Jerusalem and of the duration of the siege are both uncertain.—Theophanes, 281; Weil, i. 80.

638. Invasion of Syria by a Roman army from Diarbekr, which besieges Emesa, but is defeated. Weil, i. 81.
Antioch taken.—Theophanes, 282. Ecthesis published after September.

639. Jasdos (Aïad) takes Edessa and conquers Mesopotamia.—Theophanes, 282.
December—Amrou invades Egypt.—Weil, i. 107, notes 1, 3; Theoph. 282.

640. The 19th Hegira began 2nd January, 640.
The caliph Omar orders a census of his dominions.—Theoph. 283.
Cairo taken. Capitulation of Mokaukas for the Copts.

641. February or March—Death of Heraclius. His reign of 30 years, 4 months, 6 days, would terminate 10th February.
Heraclius Constantine reigned 103 days, to 24th May.
HERACLEONAS sole emperor less than five months.
October—Constans II.—Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, App. 177.
December—Alexandria taken by Saracens, retaken by Romans, and recovered by Saracens.

643. Omar rebuilds or repairs the temple of Jerusalem.—Theoph. 284.
Canal of Suez restored by Amrou.—Weil, i. 122.

644. Death of Omar.

647. Saracens drive Romans out of Africa, and impose tribute on the province.—Theoph. 285.
Moawyah invades Cyprus.

648. Moawyah besieges Aradus, and takes it by capitulation.
Constans II. publishes the Type.

653. Moawyah takes Rhodes, and destroys the Colossus.—Theoph. 286.

654. Pope Martin banished to Cherson.

655. Constans II. defeated by the Saracens in a great naval battle off Mount Phœnix in Lycia.

656. Othman assassinated, 17th June.

658. Expedition of Constans II. against the Sclavonians.
Peace concluded with Moawyah.

659. Constans II. puts his brother Theodosius to death.

661. Murder of Ali, 22nd January.—Weil, i. 252.
Constans II. quits Constantinople, and passes the winter at Athens.—Anastasius, *De vit. Pont. Rom.* 51.

662. Saracens ravage Romania (Asia Minor), and carry off many prisoners.—Theoph. 289.

663. Constans II. visits Rome.

A.D.

668. The Saracens advance to Chalcedon, and take Amorium, where they leave a garrison; but it is soon retaken.—Theoph. 291.
Constans II. assassinated at Syracuse.
Constantine IV. (Pogonatus).
669. The Saracens carry off 180,000 prisoners from Africa.
The troops of the Orient theme demand that the brothers of Constantine IV. should receive the imperial crown, in order that three emperors might reign on earth to represent the Trinity in heaven. —Theoph. 293.
670. Saracens pass the winter at Cyzicus.
671. Saracens pass the winter at Smyrna and in Cilicia.
672. Constantine IV. prepares ships to throw Greek fire on the Saracens, who besiege Constantinople.
673. Saracens, who have wintered at Cyzicus, penetrate into the port of Constantinople, and attack Magnaura and Cyclobium, the two forts at the continental angles of the city.
Saracens again pass the winter at Cyzicus.
674. Third year of the siege of Constantinople.
Saracen troops pass the winter in Crete.
677. Sixth year of the siege of Constantinople.
The Mardaïtes alarm the caliph Moawyah by their conquests on Mount Lebanon.
Thessalonica besieged by the Avars and Sclavonians.
678. Seventh year of the siege of Constantinople.
The Saracen fleet destroyed by Greek fire invented by Callinicus.—Theoph. 295, and Nic. Pat. 22.
Bulgarians found a monarchy south of the Danube, in the country still called Bulgaria.
Peace concluded with the caliph Moawyah.
679. War with the Bulgarians.
680. Death of the caliph Moawyah.
Sixth general council of the church.
681. Heraclius and Tiberius, the brothers of Constantine IV., are deprived of the imperial title.
684. The caliph Abdalmelik offers to purchase peace by the payment of an annual tribute of 365,000 pieces of gold, 365 slaves, and 365 horses.
685. September—Death of Constantine IV. (Pogonatus).
Justinian II. ascends the throne, aged sixteen.
686. Treaty of peace between the emperor and the caliph.
687. Emigration of Mardaïtes.
The Sclavonians of Strymon carry their piratical expeditions into the Propontis.
689. Justinian II. forces the Greeks to emigrate from Cyprus.
691. Defeat of Justinian II., and desertion of the Sclavonian colonists.
692. General council of the church *in Trullo.*
The haratch established by the caliph.
695. Justinian II. deposed, his nose cut off, and banished to Cherson.
Leontius emperor.
697. Saracens carry off great numbers of prisoners from Romania (Asia Minor).
First doge of Venice elected.
Carthage taken by the Romans, and garrisoned.

A.D.
698. Carthage retaken by the Saracens.
Leontius dethroned and his nose cut off.
Tiberius III. (Apsimar) emperor.
703. Saracens defeated in Cilicia by Heraclius, the brother of Tiberius III.
705. JUSTINIAN II. (Rhinotmetus) recovers possession of the empire.
708. The Saracens push their ravages to the Bosphorus.
709. Moslemah transports 80,000 Saracens from Lampsacus into Thrace.
710. Ravenna and Cherson treated with inhuman cruelty by Justinian II.
711. Justinian II. dethroned and murdered.
PHILIPPICUS emperor.
713. Philippicus dethroned, and his eyes put out.
ANASTASIUS II. emperor.
716. Anastasius II. dethroned.
THEODOSIUS III. emperor.
Leo the Isaurian relieves Amorium, concludes a truce with Moslemah, and is proclaimed emperor by the army.

GREECE UNDER THE ROMANS

CHAPTER I

FROM THE CONQUEST OF GREECE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTANTINOPLE AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. B.C. 146–A.D. 330.

Introduction—Changes produced by the conquest of Alexander the Great on the condition of the Greek nation—Causes of the conquest of Greece by the Romans—Treatment of Greece after its conquest—Effects of the Mithridatic War on the state of Greece—Ruin of the country by the pirates of Cilicia—Nature of the Roman provincial administration in Greece—Fiscal administration of the Romans—Depopulation of Greece caused by the Roman Government—Roman colonies established in Greece—Political condition of Greece from the time of Augustus to that of Caracalla—The Greeks and Romans never showed any disposition to unite—State of society among the Greeks—Influence of religion and philosophy—Social condition of the Greeks affected by the want of colonies of emigration—Effects produced in Greece by the inroads of the Goths—Changes which preceded the establishment of Constantinople as the capital of the Roman empire.

THE conquests of Alexander the Great effected a permanent change in the political condition of the Greek nation, and this change powerfully influenced its moral and social state during the whole period of its subjection to the Roman empire. The international system of policy by which Alexander connected Greece with Western Asia and Egypt, was only effaced by the religion of Mahomet,[1] and the conquests of the Arabs. Though Alexander was himself a Greek, both from education, and the prejudices cherished by the pride of ancestry, still neither the people of Macedonia, nor the chief part of the army, whose discipline and valour had secured his victories, was Greek, either in language or feelings.[2] Had Alexander, therefore, determined on organising

1 In conformity with the established usage, the name of the Arabian prophet is written Mahomet; but the same name when applied to any other individual is written Mohammed, as being more correct.

2 Q. Curtius, vi. 9. 35. K. O. Müller, *Ueber die Makedoner*, p. 34. Müller's *Dorians*, i. 499, Eng. trans. Plutarch (*Aratus*, 38) shows us the light in which the Greeks viewed the noblest Macedonians when compared with the Spartans.

his empire with the view of uniting the Macedonians and Persians in common feelings of opposition to the Greek nation, there can be no doubt that he could easily have accomplished the design. The Greeks might then have found themselves enabled to adopt a very different course in their national career from that which they were compelled to follow by the powerful influence exercised over them by Alexander's conduct. Alexander himself, undoubtedly, perceived that the greater numbers of the Persians, and their equality, if not superiority, in civilisation to the Macedonians, rendered it necessary for him to seek some powerful ally to prevent the absorption of the Macedonians in the Persian population, the loss of their language, manners, and nationality, and the speedy change of his empire into the sovereignty of a mere Græco-Persian dynasty. It did not escape his discernment, that the political institutions of the Greeks created a principle of nationality capable of combating the unalterable laws of the Medes and Persians.

Alexander was the noblest model of a conqueror; his ambition aspired at eclipsing the glory of his unparalleled victories by the universal prosperity which was to flow from his civil government. New cities and extended commerce were to found an era in the world's history. Even the strength of his empire was to be based on a political principle which he has the merit of discovering, and of which he proved the efficacy; this principle was the amalgamation of his subjects into one people by permanent institutions. All other conquerors have endeavoured to augment their power by the subjection of one race to another.[1] The merit of Alexander is very much increased by the nature of his position with regard to the Greek nation. The Greeks were not favourably disposed either towards his empire or his person; they would willingly have destroyed both as the surest way of securing their own liberty. But the moral energy of the Greek national character did not escape the observation of Alexander, and he resolved to render this quality available for the preservation of his empire, by introducing into the East those municipal institutions which gave it vigour, and thus facilitate the infusion of some portion of the Hellenic character into the hearts of his conquered subjects.

[1] History and poetry seem to have taken Alexander as the type of an ambitious warrior. The phrase, "Macedonia's madman," and the circumstance of his weeping for worlds to conquer, hardly convey a correct idea of one whose views of glory were so intimately connected with the effects his conquests were to produce. From Alexandria to Candahar the unlettered do him more justice.

The moderation of Alexander in the execution of his plans of reform and change is as remarkable as the wisdom of his extensive projects. In order to mould the Asiatics to his wishes, he did not attempt to enforce laws and constitutions similar to those of Greece. He had profited too well by the lessons of Aristotle to think of treating man as a machine. But he introduced Greek civilisation as an important element in his civil government, and established Greek colonies with political rights throughout his conquests. It is true that he seized all the unlimited power of the Persian monarchs, but, at the same time, he strove to secure administrative responsibility, and to establish free institutions in municipal government. Any laws or constitution which Alexander could have promulgated to enforce his system of consolidating the population of his empire into one body, would most probably have been immediately repealed by his successors, in consequence of the hostile feelings of the Macedonian army. But it was more difficult to escape from the tendency imprinted on the administration by the systematic arrangements which Alexander had introduced. He seems to have been fully aware of this fact, though it is impossible to trace the whole series of measures he adopted to accelerate the completion of his great project of creating a new state of society, and a new nation, as well as a new empire, in the imperfect records of his civil administration which have survived. His death left his own scheme incomplete, yet his success was wonderful; for though his empire was immediately dismembered, its numerous portions long retained a deep imprint of that Greek civilisation which he had introduced.[1] The influence of his philanthropic policy survived the kingdoms which his arms had founded, and tempered the despotic sway of the Romans by its superior power over society; nor was the influence of Alexander's government utterly effaced in Asia until Mahomet changed the government, the religion, and the frame of society in the East.

The monarchs of Egypt, Syria, Pergamus, and Bactriana, who were either Macedonians or Greeks, respected the civil nstitutions, the language, and the religion of their native subects, however adverse they might be to Greek usages; and the overeigns of Bithynia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Parthia,

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.* vi. 42, notices the effect of the municipal organisation of Seleucia in maintaining its liberty amidst the despotism of the Parthian empire as late as the reign of the Emperor Tiberius.

though native princes, retained a deep tincture of Greek civilisation after they had thrown off the Macedonian yoke. They not only encouraged the arts, sciences, and literature of Greece, but they even protected the peculiar political constitutions of the Greek colonies settled in their dominions, though at variance with the Asiatic views of monarchical government.

The Greeks and Macedonians long continued separate nations, though a number of the causes which ultimately produced their fusion began to exert some influence shortly after the death of Alexander. The moral and social causes which enabled the Greeks to acquire a complete superiority over the Macedonian race, and ultimately to absorb it as a component element of their own nation, were the same which afterwards enabled them to destroy the Roman influence in the East. For several generations, the Greeks appeared the feebler party in their struggle with the Macedonians. The new kingdoms, into which Alexander's empire was divided, were placed in very different circumstances from the older Greek states. Two separate divisions were created in the Hellenic world, and the Macedonian monarchies on the one hand, and the free Greeks on the other, formed two distinct international systems of policy. The Macedonian sovereigns had a balance of power to maintain, in which the free states of Europe could only be directly interested when the overwhelming influence of a conqueror placed their independence in jeopardy. The multifarious diplomatic relations of the free states among themselves required constant attention, not only to maintain their political independence, but even to protect their property and civil rights. These two great divisions of Hellenic society were often governed by opposite views and feelings in morals and politics, though their various members were continually placed in alliance as well as collision by their struggles to preserve the balance of power of their respective systems.

The immense power and wealth of the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies rendered vain all the efforts of the small European states to maintain the high military, civil, and literary rank they had previously occupied. Their best soldiers, their wisest statesmen, and their ablest authors, were induced to emigrate to a more profitable and extensive scene of action. Alexandria became the capital of the Hellenic world. Yet the history of the European states still continued to maintain its predominant interest, and as a political lesson, the struggles of the Achaian League to defend the independence of Greece

against Macedonia and Rome, are not less instructive than the annals of Athens and Sparta. The European Greeks at this period perceived all the danger to which their liberties were exposed from the wealth and power of the Asiatic monarchies, and they vainly endeavoured to effect a combination of all the free states into one federal body. Whatever might have been the success of such a combination, it certainly offered the only hope of preserving the liberty of Greece against the powerful states with which the altered condition of the civilised world had brought her into contact.

At the very time when the Macedonian kings were attacking the independence of Greece, and the Asiatic courts undermining the morals of the Greek nation, the Greek colonies, whose independence, from their remote situation, was secured against the attacks of the Eastern monarchs, were conquered by the Romans. Many circumstances tending to weaken the Greeks, and over which they had no control, followed one another with fatal celerity. The invasion of the Gauls, though bravely repulsed, inflicted great losses on Greece.[1] Shortly after, the Romans completed the conquest of the Greek states in Italy.[2] From that time the Sicilian Greeks were too feeble to be anything but spectators of the fierce struggle of the Romans and Carthaginians for the sovereignty of their island, and though the city of Syracuse courageously defended its independence, the struggle was a hopeless tribute to national glory.[3] The cities of Cyrenaica had been long subject to the Ptolemies, and the republics on the shores of the Black Sea had been unable to maintain their liberties against the repeated attacks of the sovereigns of Pontus and Bithynia.[4]

Though the Macedonians and Greeks were separated into two divisions by the opposite interests of the Asiatic monarchies and the European republics, still they were united by a powerful bond of national feelings. There was a strong similarity in the education, religion, and social position of the individual citizen in every state, whether Greek or Macedonian. Wherever Hellenic civilisation was received, the free citizens formed only one part of the population, whether the other was composed of slaves or subjects; and this peculiarity placed their civil interests as Greeks in a more important light than their political differences as subjects of various states. The

[1] B.C. 279. [2] B.C. 272. [3] B.C. 212.
[4] B.C. 220. Polybius, iv. 56. Strabo, i. 7, p. 93, edit. Tauch. Memnonis Heraclææ, *Ponti Histor. excerpt.* lib. xiii. xiv. *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, ii. 532, edit. Didot.

Macedonian Greeks of Asia and Egypt were a ruling class, governed, it is true, by an absolute sovereign, but having their interest so identified with his, in the vital question of retaining the administration of the country, that the Greeks, even in the absolute monarchies, formed a favoured and privileged class. In the Greek republics, the case was not very dissimilar; there, too, a small body of free citizens ruled a large slave or subject population, whose numbers required not only constant attention on the part of the rulers, but likewise a deep conviction of an ineffaceable separation in interests and character, to preserve the ascendancy. This peculiarity in the position of the Greeks cherished their exclusive nationality, and created a feeling that the laws of honour and of nations forbade free men ever to make common cause with slaves. The influence of this feeling was visible for centuries on the laws and education of the free citizens of Greece, and it was equally powerful wherever Hellenic civilisation spread.[1]

Alexander's conquests soon exercised a widely extended influence on the commerce, literature, morals, and religion of the Greeks. A direct communication was opened with India, with the centre of Asia, and with the southern coast of Africa. This immense extension of the commercial transactions of the Asiatic and Egyptian Greeks diminished the relative wealth and importance of the European states, while, at the same time, their stationary position assumed the aspect of decline from the rapidly increasing power and civilisation of Western Europe. A considerable trade began to be carried on directly with the great commercial depots of the East which had formerly afforded large profits to the Greeks of Europe by passing through their hands. As soon as Rome rose to some degree of power, its inhabitants, if not its franchised citizens, traded with the East, as is proved by the existence of political relations between Rome and Rhodes, more than three centuries before the Christian era.[2] There can be no doubt that the connection between the two

[1] Plutarch, *Sylla*, xviii. Plutarch, *in Hyperide. Cato*, 78. Appian, *De Bell. Civ. I.* Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv. 42; *Dig.*, xxix. 5. 1, 32. 39.

[2] Polybius, xxx. 5, 6. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, iii. 84. 2. The earliest connection of Rome with Carthage was also commercial, consequently the trading portion of the Roman state was not unimportant, though it was not represented in the body politic. This explains the adverse assertions of Polybius in his first book (c. 1), with the fact of the existence of the Carthaginian treaties noticed in his third. The Romans had trade worth regulating by treaty five hundred years before the Christian era, though personally they despised commerce; and previous to their commercial treaty with Rhodes, they had sent an embassy to Alexander the Great at Babylon, as Niebuhr allows, on the authority of Clitarchus, cited by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* iii. 9. Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, iii. 169.

states had its origin in the interests of trade. New channels were opened for mercantile enterprise as direct communications diminished the expense of transport. The increase of trade rendered piracy a profitable occupation. Both the sovereigns of Egypt and the merchants of Rhodes favoured the pirates who plundered the Syrians and Phœnicians, so that trading vessels could only navigate with safety under the protection of powerful states, in order to secure their property from extortion and plunder.[1] These alterations in commercial affairs proved every way disadvantageous to the small republics of European Greece; and Alexandria and Rhodes soon occupied the position once held by Corinth and Athens.

The literature of a people is so intimately connected with the local circumstances which influence education, taste, and morals, that it can never be transplanted without undergoing a great alteration. It is not wonderful, therefore, that the literature of the Greeks, after the extension of their dominion in the East, should have undergone a great change; but it seems remarkable that this change should have proved invariably injurious to all its peculiar excellencies. It is singular, at the same time, to find how little the Greeks occupied themselves in the examination of the stores of knowledge possessed by the Eastern nations. The situation and interests of the Asiatic and Egyptian Greeks must have compelled many to learn the languages of the countries which they inhabited, and the literature of the East was laid open to their investigation. They appear to have availed themselves very sparingly of these advantages Even in history and geography, they made but small additions to the information already collected by Herodotus, Ctesias, and Xenophon; and this supercilious neglect of foreign literature has been the cause of depriving modern times of all records of the powerful and civilised nations which flourished while Greece was in a state of barbarism. Had the Macedonians or Romans treated the history and literature of Greece with the contempt which the Greeks showed to the records of the Phœnicians, Persians, and Egyptians, it is not probable that any very extensive remains of later Greek literature would have reached us.[2] At a subsequent period, when the Arabs had conquered the

1 The Piracies of Scerdiliadas. Polybius, v. 95. Strabo, xiv. 5.

2 At a still later period the general introduction of the Latin language as the official means of communication in the East, which, from the time of Caracalla, was almost universal, was not without its effects on Greek literature. Even Greek inscriptions of a public nature become rare after the time of Caracalla.

Syrian and Egyptian Greeks, their neglect of the language and literature of Greece was severely felt.

The munificence of the Ptolemies, the Seleucidæ, and the kings of Pergamus, enabled their capitals to eclipse the literary glory of the cities of Greece. The eminent men of Europe sought their fortunes abroad; but when genius emigrated it could not transplant those circumstances which created and sustained it. In Egypt and in Syria, Greek literature lost its peculiar national character; and that divine instinct in the portraiture of nature, which had been the charm and characteristic of its earlier age, never emigrated. This deficiency forms, indeed, the marked distinction between the literature of the Grecian and Macedonian periods; and it was a natural consequence of the different situations held by literary men. Among the Asiatic and Alexandrine population, literature was a trade, knowledge was confined to the higher classes, and literary productions were addressed to a public widely dispersed and dissimilar in many tastes and habits. The authors who addressed themselves to such a public could not escape a vagueness of expression on some subjects, and an affectation of occult profundity on others. Learning and science, in so far as they could be rendered available for upholding literary renown, were most studiously cultivated, and most successfully employed; but deep feeling, warm enthusiasm, and simple truth, were, from the very nature of the case, impossible.

The frame of society in earlier times had been very different in the free states of Greece. Literature and the fine arts then formed a portion of the usual education and ordinary life of every citizen in the State; they were consequently completely under the influence of public opinion, and received the impress of the national mind which they reflected from the mirror of genius. The effects of this popular character in Greek literature and art are evident, in the total freedom of all the productions of Greece, in her best days, from anything that partakes of mannerism or exaggeration. The truer to nature any production could be rendered, which was to be offered to the attention of the people, the abler would they be to appreciate its merits, and their applause would be obtained with greater certainty; yet, at the same time, the farther the expression of nature could be removed from vulgarity, the higher would be the degree of general admiration. The sentiment necessary for the realisation of ideal perfection,

which modern civilisation vainly requires from those who labour only for the polished and artificial classes of a society broken into sections, arose in profusion, under the free instinct of the popular mind to reverence simplicity and nature, when combined with beauty and dignity.

The connection of the Greeks with Assyria and Egypt, nevertheless, aided their progress in mathematics and scientific knowledge; yet astrology was the only new object of science which their Eastern studies added to the domain of the human intellect. From the time Berosus introduced astrology into Cos, it spread with inconceivable rapidity in Europe. It soon exercised a powerful influence over the religious opinions of the higher classes, naturally inclined to fatalism, and assisted in demoralising the private and public character of the Greeks. From the Greeks it spread with additional empiricism among the Romans: it even maintained its ground against Christianity, with which it long strove to form an alliance, and it has only been extirpated in modern times.[1] The Romans, as long as they clung to their national usages and religious feelings, endeavoured to resist the progress of a study so destructive to private and public virtue; but it embodied opinions which were rapidly gaining ground. In the time of the Cæsars, astrology was generally believed, and extensively practised.[2]

The general corruption of morals which followed from the Macedonian conquests, was the inevitable effect of the position in which mankind were everywhere placed. The accumulated treasures of the Persian empire, which must have amounted to between seventy and eighty millions sterling, were suddenly thrown into general circulation. The Greeks profited greatly by the expenditure of these treasures, and their social position became soon so completely changed by the facilities afforded them of gaining high pay, and of enjoying luxury in the service of foreign princes, that public opinion ceased to exercise a direct influence on private character.[3] The mixture of Macedonians, Greeks, and natives, in the conquered countries of the East, was very incomplete, and they generally

1 Astrology was adopted by the Christians at an early period. St. Anthony was believer in its scientific pretensions, and, in modern times, Pope Paul III. and most of is cardinals. Ranke, *History of the Popes*, p. 64. Kelly's translation.

2 The astrologers or Chaldæans, as they were called, were banished from Rome, .D. 179. Valerius Max. i. 3, 2. Tacitus recounts a remarkable instance of the perstition of Tiberius, accompanied by some very curious reflections of his own. *nnals*, vi. 20–22; see also, *Hist.* i. 22; and Vitruvius, ix. 7.

3 Diodorus, xvii. 66–71. Curtius, v. 2, 8. Strabo, xv. 730. Arrian states that lexander found at Susa alone a treasury containing 50,000 talents, equal to 19,000,000 sterling; iii. 16, 12. Plutarch (*Alexander*), 37.

formed distinct classes of society: this circumstance alone contributed to weaken the feelings of moral responsibility, which are the most powerful preservatives of virtue. It is difficult to imagine a state of society more completely destitute of moral restraint than that in which the Asiatic Greeks lived. Public opinion was powerless to enforce even an outward respect for virtue; military accomplishments, talents for civil administration, literary eminence, and devotion to the power of an arbitrary sovereign, were the direct roads to distinction and wealth; honesty and virtue were very secondary qualities. In all countries or societies where a class becomes predominant, a conventional character is formed, according to the exigencies of the case, as the standard of an honourable man; and it is usually very different indeed from what is really necessary to constitute a virtuous, or even an honest citizen.

With regard to the European Greeks, high rank at the Asiatic courts was often suddenly, and indeed accidentally, placed within their reach, by qualities that had in general only been cultivated as a means of obtaining a livelihood. It is not, therefore, wonderful that wealth and power, obtained under such circumstances, should have been wasted in luxury, and squandered in the gratification of lawless passions. Yet, in spite of the complaints most justly recorded in history against the luxury, idleness, avarice, and debauchery of the Greeks, it seems surprising that the people resisted, so effectually as it did, the powerful means at work to accomplish the national ruin. There never existed a people more perfectly at liberty to gratify every passion. During two hundred and fifty years, the Greeks were the dominant class in Asia; and the corrupting influence of this predominance was extended to the whole frame of society, in their European as well as their Asiatic possessions. The history of the Achaian League, and the endeavours of Agis and Cleomenes to restore the ancient institutions of Sparta, prove that public and private virtue were still admired and appreciated by the native Greeks. The Romans, who were the loudest in condemning and satirising the vices of the Greek nation, proved far less able to resist the allurements of wealth and power; and in the course of one century, their demoralisation far exceeded the corruption of the Greeks. The severe tone in which Polybius animadverts on the vices of his countrymen, must always be contrasted with the picture of Roman depravity in the pages of Suetonius and Tacitus, in order to

form a correct estimate of the moral position of the two nations. The Greeks afford a sad spectacle of the debasing influence of wealth and power on the higher classes; but the Romans, after their Asiatic conquests, present the loathsome picture of a whole people throwing aside all moral restraint, and openly wallowing in those vices which the higher classes elsewhere have generally striven to conceal.[1]

The religion of the Greeks was little more than a section of the political constitution of the State. The power of religion depended on custom. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Greeks never possessed anything more than a national form of worship, and their religious feelings produced no very important influence on their moral conduct. The conquests of Alexander effected as great a change in religion as in manners. The Greeks willingly adopted the superstitious practices of the conquered nations, and, without hesitation, paid their devotions at the shrines of foreign divinities; but, strange to say, they never appear to have profoundly investigated either the metaphysical opinions or the religious doctrines of the Eastern nations. They treated with neglect the pure theism of Moses, and the sublime religious system of Zoroaster, while they cultivated a knowledge of the astrology, necromancy, and sorcery of the Chaldæans, Syrians, and Egyptians.

The separation of the higher and lower ranks of society, which only commenced among the Greeks after their Asiatic conquests, produced a marked effect on the religious ideas of the nation. Among the wealthy and the learned, indifference to all religions rapidly gained ground. The philosophical speculations of Alexander's age tended towards scepticism; and the state of mankind, in the following century, afforded practical proofs to the ancients of the insufficiency of virtue and reason to insure happiness and success either in public or private life. The consequence was, that the greater number embraced the belief in a blind overruling destiny,—while a few became atheists. The absurdities of popular paganism had been exposed and ridiculed, while its mythology had not yet been explained by philosophical allegories. No system of philosophy, on the other hand, had sought to enforce its moral truths among the people, by declaring the principle of man's responsibility. The lower orders were without philosophy, the higher without religion.

[1] Romans, chap. i. ver. 26–32. Juvenal, Tacitus, and Lucian, are full of illustrations.

This separation in the feelings and opinions of the different ranks of society, rendered the value of public opinion comparatively insignificant to the philosophers; and consequently their doctrines were no longer addressed to the popular mind. The education of the lower orders, which had always depended on the public lessons they had received from voluntary teachers in the public places of resort, was henceforward neglected; and the priests of the temples, the diviners and soothsayers, became their instructors and guides. Under such guidance, the old mythological fables, and the new wonders of the Eastern magicians, were employed as the surest means of rendering the superstitious feelings of the people, and the popular dread of supernatural influences, a source of profit to the priesthood.[1] While the educated became the votaries of Chaldæans and astrologers, the ignorant were the admirers of Egyptians and conjurers.[2]

The Greek nation, immediately before the conquest of the Romans, was rich both in wealth and numbers. Alexander had thrown the accumulated treasures of centuries into circulation; the dismemberment of his empire prevented his successors from draining the various countries of the world, to expend their resources on a single city. The number of capitals and independent cities in the Grecian world kept money in circulation, enabled trade to flourish, and caused the Greek population to increase. The elements of national prosperity are so various and complex, that a knowledge of the numbers of a people affords no certain criterion for estimating their wealth and happiness; still, if it were possible to obtain accurate accounts of the population of all the countries inhabited by the Greeks after the death of Alexander, such knowledge would afford better means of estimating the real progress or decline of social civilisation, than either the records which history has preserved of the results of wars and negotiations, or than the memorials of art and literature. The population of Greece, as of every other country, must have varied very much at different periods; even the proportion of the slaves to the free inhabitants can never have long remained exactly the same. We are, unfortunately, so complete ignorant of the relative density of the Greek population different periods, and so well assured that its absolute numbe

[1] Apuleius, *Metam.* viii. p. 571.

[2] Lucian's *Alexander*, and the *Life of Apollonius Tyaneus*, by Philostratus, belo to a much later period, but they afford the means of illustrating this subject.

depended on many causes which it is now impossible to appreciate fully, that it would be a vain endeavour to attempt to fix the period when the Greek race was most numerous. The empire of the Greeks was most extensive during the century which elapsed immediately after the death of Alexander; but it would be unsafe to draw, from that single fact, any certain conclusion concerning the numbers of the Greek race at that period, as compared with the following century.

The fallacy of any inferences concerning the population of ancient times, which are drawn from the numbers of the inhabitants in modern times, is apparent, when we reflect on the rapid increase of mankind, in the greater part of Europe, in late years. Gibbon estimates the population of the Roman empire, in the time of Claudius, at one hundred and twenty millions, and he supposed modern Europe to contain, at the time he wrote, one hundred and seven millions.[1] Seventy years have not elapsed, and yet the countries which he enumerated now contain upwards of two hundred and ten millions.[2] The variations which have taken place in the numbers of the Jews at different periods, illustrate the vicissitudes to which an expatriated population, like a large portion of the Greek nation, is always liable. The Jews have often been far less—perhaps they have been frequently more numerous—than they are at present, yet their numbers now seem to equal what they were at the era of the greatest wealth, power, and glory of their nation under Solomon.[3] A very judicious writer has estimated the population of continental Greece, Peloponnesus, and the Ionian Islands, at three millions and a half, during the period which elapsed from the Persian wars to the death of Alexander.[4] Now, if we admit a

1 *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, in 1776, vol. i. p. 179 of Dr. Smith's edition. In 1854, the population of Europe was 260,700,000.

2 See the tables of population in the *Almanach de Gotha*, 1842.

3 The census of David (2 Samuel xxiv. 9) shows that the Jews were then about five millions. The immense riches of Solomon (1 Kings x. 14, 22), who must have had about two millions sterling of annual revenue, and the present population of Malta and Guernsey, which is proportionally greater than that of Judæa in ancient times, render this neither improbable nor miraculous. In the time of our Saviour the Jews were very numerous, and very widely dispersed, and had already lost their own language, and adopted that of the countries they inhabited (Acts ii. 9). The Greeks were always more tenacious of their language. See also Josephus, *Ant. XIV.* vii. 2.

4 Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, ii. 386. But the extreme uncertainty of all calculations about population in ancient times is evident from a comparison of the various opinions of Boeckh and Letronne concerning the population of Attica; of Brottier, Gibbon, and Dureau de la Malle, concerning that of Rome. With regard to the population of Attica, Boeckh makes it 500,000; Letronne only 220,000. See Leake's *Topography of Athens and Attica*, 2 vols, 1840, vol. i. 618. After a judicious examination of the subject Colonel Leake fixes the population of Attica at 527,000. Strabo, xvii.

similar density of population in Crete, Cyprus, the islands of the Archipelago, and the colonies on the coasts of Thrace and Asia Minor, this number would require to be more than doubled. The population of European Greece declined after the time of Alexander. Money became more abundant; it was easy for a Greek to make his fortune abroad; increased wealth augmented the wants of the free citizens, and the smaller states became incapable of supporting as large a free population as in earlier times, when wants were fewer, and emigration difficult. The size of properties and the number of slaves, therefore, increased. The diminution which had taken place in the population of Greece must, however, have been trifling, when compared with the immense increase in the Greek population of Asia and Egypt; in Magna Græcia, Sicily, and Cyrene, the number of the Greeks had not decreased.[1] Greek civilisation had extended itself from the banks of the Indus to the Pillars of Hercules, and from the shores of the Palus Mæotis to the island of Dioscorides. It may therefore be admitted, that the Greeks were, at no earlier period of their history, more numerous than at the time the Romans commenced the subjugation of the countries which they inhabited.

The history of the Greeks under the Roman domination tends to correct the opinion, that national changes are to be solely attributed to those remarkable occurrences which occupy the most prominent place in the annals of states. It not unfrequently happened that those events which produced the greatest change on the fortunes of the Romans, exerted no very important or permanent influence on the fate of the Greeks; while, on the other hand, some change in the state of India, Bactria, Ethiopia, or Arabia, by altering the direction of commerce, powerfully influenced their prosperity and future destinies. A revolution in the commercial intercourse between Europe and eastern Asia assisted in producing the great

p. 833, mentions that Carthage contained a population of 700,000 at the commencement of the third Punic war, and Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 30, tells us that Seleucia had 600,000 inhabitants. Diodorus, xvii. 42, says Alexandria had 300,000 free inhabitants.

[1] Cicero furnishes data for framing a calculation of the numbers of the population in Sicily in his time. They seem to have been about two millions. *Economie Politique des Romains*, par Dureau de la Malle, ii. 380. We possess likewise exact information concerning the army and revenues of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 245). His kingdom embraced Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, and Cilicia. His army consisted of 200,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry, 2000 war chariots, and 400 elephants; his fleet, of 1500 galleys of war, and 1000 ships of transport. The annual revenues of his kingdom were 14,800 talents, or £2,500,000 in money, and 1,500,000 artabas, or five million bushels of wheat paid in kind. His treasury was said to contain seven hundred and forty thousand talents, or above one hundred millions sterling.—*Egypt under the Ptolemies*, by Samuel Sharpe, p. 94.

changes which took place in the Greek nation, from the period of the subjection of Greece by the Romans, to that of the conquest of the semi-Greek provinces which had belonged to the Macedonian empire, by the Saracens. The history of mankind requires a more accurate illustration than has yet been undertaken, of the causes of the general degradation of all the political governments with which we are acquainted, during this eventful period; but the task belongs to universal history. To obtain a correct view of the social condition of the European nations in the darkest periods of the middle ages, it is necessary to examine society through a Greek as well as a Roman medium, and to weigh the experience and the passions of the East against the force and the prejudices of the West. It will then be found, that many germs of that civilisation which seemed to have arisen in the dark ages as a natural development of society, were really borrowed from the Greek people and the Byzantine empire, in which a Græco-Macedonian civilisation long pervaded society.

Section I

IMMEDIATE CAUSES OF THE CONQUEST OF GREECE BY THE ROMANS

The great difference which existed in the social condition of the Greeks and Romans during the whole of their national existence, must be kept in view, in order to form a just idea of their relative position when ruled by the same government. The Romans formed a nation with the organisation of a single city; their political government, always partaking of its municipal origin, was a type of concentration in administrative power, and was enabled to pursue its objects with undeviating steadiness of purpose. The Greeks were a people composed of a number of rival states, whose attention was incessantly diverted to various objects. The great end of existence among the Romans was war; they were the children of Mars, and they reverenced their progenitor with the most fervent enthusiasm. Agriculture itself was only honoured from necessity. Among the Greeks, civil virtues were called into action by the multifarious exigencies of society, and were honoured and deified by the nation. Linked together by an international system of independent states, the Greeks regarded war as a means of obtaining some definite object, in accord-

ance with the established balance of power. A state of peace was, in their view, the natural state of mankind. The Romans regarded war as their permanent occupation; their national and individual ambition was exclusively directed to conquest. The subjection of their enemies, or a perpetual struggle for supremacy, was the only alternative that war presented to their minds.

The success of the Roman arms, and the conquest of Greece, were the natural results of concentrated national feelings, and superior military organisation, contending with an ill-cemented political league, and an inferior military system. The Roman was instructed to regard himself merely as a component part of the republic, and to view Rome as placed in opposition to the rest of mankind. The Greek, though he possessed the moral feeling of nationality quite as powerfully as the Roman, could not concentrate equal political energy. The Greeks after the period of the Macedonian conquests, occupied the double position of members of a widely spread and dominant people, and of citizens of independent states. Their minds were enlarged by this extension of their sphere of civilisation; but what they gained in general feelings of philanthropy, they appear to have lost in patriotic attachment to the interest of their native states.

It would be a vain exercise of ingenuity to speculate on the course of events, and on the progress of civilisation in the ancient world, had the national spirit of Greece been awakened in her struggle with Rome, and the war between the two peoples involved the question of Greek nationality, as well as political independence. On the one hand, Greece and Rome might be supposed existing as rival states, mutually aiding the progress of mankind by their emulation; on the other, the extinction of the Greek people, as well as the destruction of their political government, might be regarded as a not improbable event. No strong national feeling was, however, raised in Greece by the wars with Rome, and the contest remained only a political one in the eyes of the people; consequently, even if the military power of the belligerents had been more nearly balanced than it really was, the struggle could hardly have terminated in any other way than by the subjugation of the Greeks.

It seems at first sight more difficult to explain the causes of the facility with which the Greeks accommodated themselves to the Roman sway, and of the rapidity with which they sank

nto political insignificancy, than the ease with which they were vanquished in the field. The fact, however, is undeniable, that the conquest was generally viewed with satisfaction by the great body of the inhabitants of Greece, who considered the destruction of the numerous small independent governments in the country, as a necessary step towards improving their own condition. The political constitutions even of the most democratic states of Greece excluded so large a portion of the inhabitants from all share in the public administration, and after the introduction of large mercenary armies, military service became so severe a burden on the free citizens, that the majority looked with indifference on the loss of their independence, when that loss appeared to insure a permanent state of peace. The selfishness of the Greek aristocracy, which was prominently displayed at every period of history, proved peculiarly injurious in the latter days of Greek independence. The aristocracy of the Greek cities and states indulged their ambition and cupidity to the ruin of their country. The selfishness of the Roman aristocracy was possibly as great, but it was very different. It found gratification in increasing the power and glory of Rome, and it identified itself with pride and patriotism; Greek selfishness, on the contrary, submitted to every meanness from which an aristocracy usually recoils, in order to gratify its passions, to which it even sacrificed its country. Greece had arrived at that period of civilisation, when political questions were determined by financial reasons, and the hope of a diminution of the public burdens was a powerful argument in favour of submission to Rome. When the Romans conquered Macedonia, they fixed the tribute at one half the amount which had been paid to the Macedonian kings.[1]

At the period of the Roman conquest, public opinion had been vitiated, as well as weakened, by the power and corrupt influence of the Asiatic monarchies. Many of the Greek princes employed large sums in purchasing the military services and civic flatteries of the free states. The political and military leaders throughout Greece were thus, by means of foreign alliances, rendered masters of resources far beyond what the unassisted revenues of the free states could have placed at their disposal. It soon became evident that the fate

1 Livy, xlv. 18. The instructions to the commissioners appointed to settle the affairs of Macedonia and Illyria give an admirable and concise picture of the policy of Rome while she was still aspiring at conquest, and dared not forego the advantages to be derived from appearing as the champion of the people's cause.

of many of the free states depended on their alliances with the kings of Macedonia, Egypt, Syria, and Pergamus; and the citizens could not avoid the despairing conclusion that no exertion on their part could produce any decisive effect in securing the tranquillity of Greece. They could only increase their own taxes, and bring to their own homes all the miseries of a most inhuman system of warfare. This state of public affairs caused the despair which induced the Acarnanians,[1] and the citizens of Abydos,[2] to adopt the heroic resolution not to survive the loss of their independence; but its more general effect was to spread public and private demoralisation through all ranks of society. Peace alone, to the reflecting Greeks, seemed capable of restoring security of property, and of re-establishing due respect for the principles of justice; and peace seemed only attainable by submission to the Romans. The continuation of a state of war, which was rapidly laying the fortified towns in ruin, and consuming the resources of the land, was regarded by the independent Greeks as a far greater evil than the acknowledgment of the Roman supremacy. So ardently was the termination of the contest desired by the great body of the people, that a common proverb, expressive of a wish that the Romans might speedily prevail, was everywhere current. This saying, which was common after the conquest, has been preserved by Polybius: "If we had not been quickly ruined, we should not have been saved."[3]

It was some time before the Greeks had great reason to regret their fortune. A combination of causes, which could hardly have entered into the calculations of any politician, enabled them to preserve their national institutions, and to exercise all their former social influence, even after the annihilation of their political existence. Their vanity was flattered by their admitted superiority in arts and literature, and by the respect paid to their usages and prejudices by the Romans. Their political subjection was at first not very burdensome; and a considerable portion of the nation was allowed to retain the appearance of independence. Athens and Sparta were honoured with the title of allies of Rome.[4]

[1] Livy, xxvi. 25.

[2] Polybius, xvi. 32. Livy, xxxi. 17. And the financial oppression of the Romans at Tarsus caused a similar despair at a later period. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* iv.

[3] Polybius, xl. 5, 12.

[4] Athens retained this independent existence, partaking something of the position of Hamburg in the Germanic body, until the time of Caracalla, when its citizens were absorbed into the Roman empire, by the decree which conferred the rights and imposed the burdens of Roman citizenship on all the free inhabitants in the dominions of Rome.

The nationality of the Greeks was so interwoven with their municipal institutions, that the Romans found it impossible to abolish the local administration; and an imperfect attempt, made at the time of the conquest of Achaia, was soon abandoned. These local institutions ultimately modified the Roman administration itself, long before the Roman empire ceased to exist; and, even though the Greeks were compelled to adopt the civil law and judicial forms of Rome, its political authority in the East was guided by the feelings of the Greeks, and moulded according to Greek customs.

The social rank which the Greeks held in the eyes of their conquerors, at the time of their subjection, is not to be overlooked. The bulk of the Greek population in Europe consisted of landed proprietors, occupying a position which would have given some rank in Roman society. No class precisely similar existed at Rome, where a citizen that did not belong to the senate, the aristocracy, or the administration, was of very little account, for the people always remained in an inferior social rank.[1] The higher classes at Rome always felt either contempt or hostility towards the populace of the city; and even when the emperors were induced to favour the people, from a wish to depress the great families of the aristocracy, they were unable to efface the general feeling of contempt with which the people was regarded. To the Greeks,—who had always maintained a higher social position, not only in Europe, but also in the kingdoms of the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies,—a high position was conceded by the Roman aristocracy, as it awakened no feelings either of hostility or jealousy. Polybius was an example.

Section II

Treatment of Greece after its Conquest

The Romans generally commenced by treating their provinces with mildness. The government of Sicily was arranged on a basis which certainly did not augment the burdens on the inhabitants. The tribute imposed on Macedonia was less than the amount of taxation which she had paid to her own kings; and there is no reason for supposing that the burdens of the Greeks, whose country was embraced in the

[1] The tribune Lucius Martius Philippus asserted, that there were not 2000 Roman citizens proprietors of land. Cicero, *De Offic.* ii. 21.

province of Achaia, were increased by the conquest. The local municipal administration of the separate cities was allowed to exist, but, in order to enforce submission more readily, their constitutions were modified by fixing a census, which restricted the franchise in the democratic commonwealths.[1] Some states were long allowed to retain their own political government, and were ranked as allies of the republic. It is impossible to trace the changes which the Romans gradually effected in the financial and administrative condition of Greece with chronological precision. Facts, often separated by a long series of years, require to be gleaned; and caution must be used in attributing to them a precise influence on the state of society at other periods. The Roman senate was evidently not without great jealousy and some fear of the Greeks; and great prudence was displayed in adopting a number of measures by which they were gradually weakened, and cautiously broken to the yoke of their conquerors. This caution proves that the despair of the Achaians had produced a considerable effect on the Romans, who perceived that the Greek nation, if roused to a general combination, possessed the means of offering a determined and dangerous resistance. It was not until after the time of Augustus, when the conquest of every portion of the Greek nation had been completed, that the Romans began to view the Greeks in the contemptible light in which they are represented by the writers of the capital. Crete was not reduced into the form of a province until about eight years after the subjection of Achaia, and its conquest was not effected without difficulty, after a war of three years, by the presence of a consular army. The resistance it offered was so obstinate, that it was almost depopulated ere the Romans could complete its conquest.[2]

No attempt was made to introduce uniformity into the general government of the Grecian states; any such plan, indeed, would have been contrary to the principles of the Roman government, which had never aspired at establishing unity even in the administration of Italy. The attention of the Romans was directed to the means of ruling their various conquests in the most efficient manner, of concentrating all the military power in their own hands, and of levying the greatest amount of tribute which circumstances would permit.

[1] Pausanias, vii. 16, 6.
[2] B.C. 67. Freinsheim, *Supp. Liv.* xcix. 47.

Thus, numerous cities in Greece, possessing but a very small territory, as Delphi, Tespiæ, Tanagra, and Elatæa, were allowed to retain that degree of independence, which secured to them the privilege of being governed by their own laws and usages, so late even as the times of the emperors. Rhodes also long preserved its own government as a free state,[1] though it was completely dependent on Rome. The Romans adopted no theoretical principles which required them to enforce uniformity in the geographical divisions, or in the administrative arrangements of the provinces of their empire, particularly where local habits or laws opposed a barrier to any practical union.

The Roman government, however, soon adopted measures tending to diminish the resources of the Greek states when received as allies of the republic. We are informed by Diodorus, that in consequence of the tyranny of the collectors of the tribute in Sicily, numbers of free citizens were reduced to slavery.[2] These slaves were sold even within the dominions of the king of Bithynia. This conduct of the Romans produced an extensive insurrection of the slaves; and contemporary with a seditious rising in Sicily, there occurred also a great rebellion of the slaves employed in the silver mines of Attica.[3] The Attic slaves seized the fortified town of Sunium, and committed extensive ravages before the government of Athens was able to overpower them. It is so natural for slaves to rebel when a favourable occasion presents itself, that it is hazardous to look beyond ordinary causes for any explanation of this insurrection, particularly as the declining state of the silver mines of Laurium, at this period, rendered the slaves less valuable, and would cause them to be worse treated, and more negligently guarded. Still the simultaneous rebellion of slaves, in these two distant Greek countries, seems not unconnected with the measures of the Roman government towards its subjects.

If we could place implicit faith in the testimony of so firm and partial an adherent of the Romans as Polybius, we must believe, that the Roman administration was at first char-

1 Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 58. The precise privileges of autonomia in the Roman empire do not appear to be exactly determined.

2 Diod. Sic., xxxvi. 1.

3 Athenæus, vi. 104. There were two servile wars in Sicily. The first, B.C. 134 to 32, and the second, B.C. 103, which lasted almost four years. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. iii. The rebellion of the Attic slaves occurred during the first; and about the same time insurrections of slaves took place at Delos and other places in Greece. Diodorus, *Frag.* xxxiv. 3.

acterised by a love of justice, and that the Roman magistrates were far less venal than the Greeks. If the Greeks, he says, are intrusted with a single talent of public money, though they give written security, and though legal witnesses be present, they will never act honestly; but if the largest sums be confided to the Romans engaged in the public service, their honourable conduct is secured simply by an oath.[1] Under such circumstances, the people must have appreciated highly the advantages of the Roman domination, and contrasted the last years of their troubled and doubtful independence with the just and peaceful government of Rome, in a manner extremely favourable to their new masters. Less than a century of irresponsible power effected a wonderful change in the conduct of the Roman magistrates. Cicero declares, that the senate made a traffic of justice to the provincials. There is nothing so holy, that it cannot be violated, nothing so strong, that it cannot be destroyed by money, are his words.[2] But as the government of Rome grew more oppressive, and the amount of the taxes levied on the provinces was more severely exacted, the increased power of the republic rendered any rebellion of the Greeks utterly hopeless. The complete separation in the administration of the various provinces, which were governed like so many separate kingdoms, viceroyalties, or pashalics, and the preservation of a distinct local government in each of the allied kingdoms and free states, rendered their management capable of modification, without any compromise of the general system of the republic; and this admirable fitness of its administration to the exigencies of the times, remained an attribute of the Roman state for many centuries. Each state in Greece, continuing in possession of as much of its peculiar political constitution as was compatible with the supremacy and fiscal views of a foreign conqueror, retained all its former jealousies towards its neighbours, and its interests were likely to be as often compromised by disputes with the surrounding Greek states as with the Roman government. Prudence and local interests would everywhere favour submission to Rome: national vanity alone would whisper incitements to venture on a struggle for independence.

[1] Polybius, vi. 56, 13.
[2] *In Verrem.* 1, 2.

Section III

Effects of the Mithridatic War on the State of Greece

For sixty years after the conquest of Achaia, the Greeks remained docile subjects of Rome. But during that period, the policy of the government aided the tendencies of society towards the accumulation of property in the hands of few individuals. The number of Roman usurers increased, and the exactions of Roman publicans in collecting the taxes became more oppressive, so that when the army of Mithridates invaded Greece, B.C. 86, while Rome appeared plunged in anarchy by the civil broils of the partisans of Marius and Sylla, the Greeks in office conceived the vain hope of recovering their independence. When they saw the king drive the Romans out of Asia and transport a large army into Europe, they expected him to rival the exploits of Hannibal, and to carry the war into Italy. But the people in general did not take much interest in the contest; they viewed it as a struggle for supremacy between the Romans and the King of Pontus; and public opinion favoured the former, as likely to prove the milder and more equitable masters. Many of the leading men in Greece, and the governments of most of those states and cities which retained their independence, declared in favour of Mithridates. Some Lacedæmonian and Achaian troops joined his army, and Athens engaged heartily in his party. As soon, however, as Sylla appeared in Greece with his army, every state hastened to submit to Rome, with the exception of the Athenians, who probably had some particular cause of dissatisfaction at this time.[1] The vanity of the Athenians, puffed up by constant allusions to their fame, induced them to engage in a direct contest with the whole force of Rome. They were commanded by a demagogue and philosopher named Aristion, whom they had elected Strategos and intrusted with absolute power. The Roman legions were led by Sylla.[2] The exclusive vanity of the Athenians, while it cherished in their hearts a more ardent love of liberty than had survived in the rest of Greece, blinded them to their own insignificancy when compared with the belligerents into whose quarrel they rashly thrust themselves. But though they rushed

1 Zinkeisen, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, 467, n. 1. Athenæus, v. 48.
2 Aristion is called Athenion by two ancient writers.

precipitately into the war, they conducted themselves in it with great constancy. Sylla was compelled to besiege Athens in person; and the defence of the city was conducted with such courage and obstinacy, that the task of subduing it proved one of great difficulty to a Roman army, commanded by that celebrated warrior. When the defence grew hopeless, the Athenians sent a deputation to Sylla to open negotiations; but the orator beginning to recount the glories of their ancestors at Marathon, as an argument for mercy, the proud Roman cut short the discussion with the remark, that his country had sent him to Athens to punish rebels, not study history.[1] Athens was at last taken by assault, and it was treated by Sylla with unnecessary cruelty; the rapine of the troops was encouraged, instead of being checked, by their general. The majority of the citizens was slain; the carnage was so fearfully great, as to become memorable even in that age of bloodshed; the private movable property was seized by the soldiery, and Sylla assumed some merit to himself for not committing the rifled houses to the flames. He declared that he saved the city from destruction, and allowed Athens to continue to exist, only on account of its ancient glory. He carried off some of the columns of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, to ornament Rome; but as that temple was in an unfinished state, and he inflicted no injury on any public building, it seems probable that he only removed materials which were ready for transport, without pulling down any part of the edifice. From the treasury of the Parthenon, however, he carried off 40 talents of gold and 600 of silver.[2] The fate of the Piræus, which he utterly destroyed, was more severe than that of Athens. From Sylla's campaign in Greece, the commencement of the ruin and depopulation of the country is to be dated. The destruction of property caused by his ravages in Attica was so great, that Athens from that time lost its commercial as well as its political importance. The race of Athenian citizens was almost extirpated, and a new population, composed of a heterogeneous mass of settlers, received the right of citizenship.[3] Still as Sylla left Athens in possession of freedom and autonomia, with the rank of an allied city, the vitality of Greek institutions inspired the

[1] Plutarch, *Sylla*. Marathon has proved a sad stumblingblock to Greek rhetoricians, from the time of Plato down to the days of the Logiotati. Ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ ὁ Μαραθὼν καὶ ὁ Κυναίγειρος, ὧν οὐκ ἂν τι ἄνευ γένοιτο. Lucian, *Rhetor. Præcept.* 18.

[2] Appian, 39.

[3] Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 55.

altered body; the ancient forms and laws continued to exist in their former purity, and the Areopagus is mentioned by Tacitus, in the reign of Tiberius, as nobly disregarding the powerful protection of Piso, who strove to influence its decisions, and corrupt the administration of justice.[1]

Athens was not the only city in Greece which suffered severely from the cruelty and rapacity of Sylla. He plundered Delos, Delphi, Olympia, and the sacred enclosure of Æsculapius, near Epidaurus; and he razed Anthedon, Larymna, and Halæ to the ground. After he had defeated Archelaus, the general of Mithridates, at Cheronea, he deprived Thebes of half its territory, which he consecrated to Apollo and Jupiter. The administration of the temporal affairs of the pagan deities was not so wisely conducted as the civil business of the municipalities. The Theban territory declined in wealth and population, and in the time of Pausanias the Cadmea or citadel was the only inhabited portion of ancient Thebes. Both parties, during the Mithridatic war, inflicted severe injuries on Greece, plundered the country, and destroyed property most wantonly. Many of the losses were never repaired. The foundations of national prosperity were undermined; and it henceforward became impossible to save from the annual consumption of the inhabitants the sums necessary to replace the accumulated capital of ages, which this short war had annihilated. In some cases the wealth of the communities became insufficient to keep the existing public works in repair.

Section IV

Ruin of the country by the pirates of Cilicia.

The Greeks, far from continuing to enjoy permanent tranquillity under the powerful protection of Rome, found themselves exposed to the attacks of every enemy, against whom the policy of their masters did not require the employment of a regular army. The conquest of the eastern shores of the Mediterranean by the Romans destroyed the maritime police which had been enforced by the Greek states as long as they possessed an independent navy. But even Rhodes, after its services ceased to be indispensable, was watched with jealousy

[1] Plutarch, *Sylla*. Strabo, ix. 398. Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 53. The Athenians were forbidden to make a trade of selling their citizenship by Augustus, but they soon resumed the practice, and appear to have sold it cheap.—*Anthologia Græca*, xi. 319; Dom. iii. 70.

[2] Plutarch, *Sylla*.

by the Romans, though it had remained firmly attached to Rome and given asylum to numbers of Roman citizens who fled from Asia Minor to escape death at the hands of the partisans of Mithridates. The caution of the senate did not allow the provinces to maintain any considerable armed force, either by land or sea; and the guards whom the free cities were permitted to keep, were barely sufficient to protect the walls of their citadels. Armies of robbers, and fleets of pirates, remains of the mercenary forces of the Asiatic monarchs, disbanded in consequence of the Roman victories, began to infest the coasts of Greece. As long as the provinces continued able to pay their taxes with regularity, and the trade of Rome did not suffer directly, little attention was paid to the sufferings of the Greeks.

The geographical configuration of European Greece, intersected, in every direction, by high and rugged mountains, and separated by deep gulfs and bays into a number of promontories and peninsulas, renders communication between the thickly peopled and fertile districts more difficult than in most other regions. The country opposes barriers to internal trade, and presents difficulties to the formation of plans of mutual defence between the different districts, which it requires care and judgment, on the part of the general government, to remove. The armed force that can instantly be collected at one point, must often be small; and this circumstance has marked out Greece as a suitable field where piratical bands may plunder, as they have it in their power to remove their forces to distant spots with great celerity. From the earliest ages of history to the present day, these circumstances, combined with the extensive trade which has always been carried on in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, have rendered the Grecian seas the scene of constant piracies. At many periods, the pirates have been able to assemble forces sufficient to give their expeditions the character of regular war; and their pursuits have been so lucrative, and their success so great, that their profession has ceased to be viewed as a dishonourable occupation.[1]

A system of piracy, which was carried on by considerable armies and large fleets, began to be formed soon after the

[1] Piracy flourished before the time of Homer, and it had some flattering reminiscences in the days of Tournefort. It is said that the piracies committed during the late revolutionary war contributed quite as much as the humanity of the allies to the signature of the treaty of the 6th of July 1827, and to the foundation of a German monarchy in Greece.

onclusion of the Mithridatic war. The indefinite nature of he Roman power in the East, the weakness of the Asiatic nonarchs and of the sovereigns of Egypt, the questionable ature of the protection which Rome accorded to her allies, nd the general disarming of the European Greeks, all enouraged and facilitated the enterprises of these pirates. A olitical, as well as a military organisation, was given to their orces, by the seizure of several strong positions on the coast f Cilicia. From these stations they directed their expeditions ver the greater part of the Mediterranean.[1] The immense ealth which ages of prosperity had accumulated in the small owns and numerous temples of Greece was now defenceless; he country was exposed to daily incursions, and a long list of he devastations of the Cilician pirates is recorded in history. Many even of the largest and wealthiest cities in Europe and sia were successfully attacked and plundered, and the greater umber of the celebrated temples of antiquity were robbed of heir immense treasures. Samos, Clazomene, and Samothrace, he great temples at Hermione, Epidaurus, Tænarus, Calauria, ctium, Argos, and the Isthmus of Corinth, were all pillaged. o such an extent was this system of robbery carried, and so owerful and well-disciplined were the forces of the pirates, hat it was at last necessary for Rome either to share with hem the dominion of the sea, or to devote all her military hergies to their destruction. In order to carry on war with his band,—the last remains of the mercenaries who had upeld the Macedonian empire in the East,—Pompey was vested with extraordinary powers as commander-in-chief over he whole Mediterranean. An immense force was placed at s absolute disposal, and he was charged with a degree of thority over the officers of the republic, and the allies of the ate, which had never before been intrusted to one invidual. His success in the execution of this commission as considered one of his most brilliant military achieveents; he captured ninety ships with brazen beaks and took enty thousand prisoners. Some of these prisoners were tablished in towns on the coast of Cilicia; and Soli, which rebuilt, and peopled with these pirates, was honoured with e name of Pompeiopolis. The Romans, consequently, do t seem to have regarded these pirates as having engaged in disgraceful warfare, otherwise Pompey would hardly have ntured to make them his clients.

[1] Appian, *De Bello Mith.* 92, 3. Plutarch, *Pompey*, 24.

The proceedings of the senate during the piratical war, revealed to the Greeks the full extent of the disorganisation which already prevailed in the Roman government. The administration was in a state of anarchy; a few families who considered themselves above the law, and who submitted to no moral restraint, ruled both the senate and the people, so that the policy of the republic changed and vacillated according to the interests and passions of a small number of leading men in Rome. Some events during the conquest of Crete afford a remarkable instance of the incredible disorder in the republic, which foreshadowed the necessity of a single despot as the only escape from anarchy. While Pompey, with unlimited power over the shores and islands of the Mediterranean, was exterminating piracy and converting pirates into citizens, Metellus, under the authority of the senate, was engaged in conquering the island of Crete, in order to add it to the list of Roman provinces of which the senate alone named the governors. A conflict of authority arose between Pompey and Metellus. The latter was cruel and firm; the former mild but ambitious, and eager to render the whole maritime population of the east his dependents. He became jealous of the success of Metellus, and sent one of his lieutenants to stop the siege of the Cretan towns invested by the Roman army. But Metellus was not deterred by seeing the ensigns of Pompey's authority displayed from the walls. He pursued his conquests, and neither Pompey nor the times were yet prepared for an open civil war between consular armies.[1]

Crete had been filled with the strongholds of the pirates as well as Cilicia, and there is no doubt that the greater number consisted of Greeks who could find no other means of subsistence. Despair is said to have driven many of the citizens of the states conquered by the Romans to suicide; it must certainly have forced a far greater number to embrace a life of piracy and robbery. The government of Rome was at this time subject to continual revolutions; and in the disorders produced by the civil wars, the Romans lost all respect for the rights of property either at home or abroad. Wealth and power were the only objects of pursuit, and the force of all moral ties was broken. Justice ceased to be administered, and men, in such cases, always assume the right of revenging their own wrongs. Those who considered themselves aggrieved

[1] Plutarch, *Pompey*, 29. Florus, iii. 7. Dion Cassius, xxxvi. 8. See article "Metellus Creticus" (No. 23) in Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*.

y any act of oppression, or fancied they had received some evere injury, sought revenge in the way which presented self most readily; and when the oppressor was secure against neir attacks, they made society responsible. The state of ublic affairs was considered an apology for the ravages of the irates even in those districts of Greece which suffered most everely from their lawless conduct. They probably spent berally among the poor the treasures which they wrested rom the rich; and so little, indeed, were they placed beyond ne pale of society, that Pompey himself settled a colony of nem at Dyme, in Achaia, where they seem to have prospered.[1] Though piracy was not subsequently carried on so extensively s to merit a place in history, it was not entirely extirpated ven by the fleet which the Roman emperors maintained in ne East; and that cases still continued to occur in the recian seas is proved by public inscriptions.[2] The careless-ess of the senate in superintending the administration of the istant provinces caused a great increase of social corruption, nd left crimes against the property and persons of the pro-incials often unpunished. Kidnapping by land and sea ecame a regular profession. The great slave-mart of Delos nabled the man-stealers to sell thousands in a single day. ven open brigandage was allowed to exist in the heart of ne eastern provinces at the time of Rome's greatest power. trabo mentions several robber chiefs who maintained them-elves in their fastnesses like independent princes.[3]

Section V

Nature of the Roman Provincial Administration in Greece

The Romans reduced those countries where they met with sistance into the form of provinces, a procedure which was enerally equivalent to abrogating the existing laws, and nposing on the vanquished a new system of civil as well as olitical administration. In the countries inhabited by the reeks this policy underwent considerable modification. The

1 Strabo, viii. c. 7. This colony went to ruin during the civil war, and the colonists sumed their old habits of piracy. Dyme was placed under the government of Patras ien that city was made a Roman colony by Augustus.—Pausanias, vii. 17, 3.

2 Boeckh, *Corpus Inscrip. Græcarum*, Nos. 2335 and 2347; and "Addenda," No. 63. Tom. ii. p. 1032.

3 Strabo, xiv. 5, 2, and xii. 8, where he mentions Cleon the brigand chief on Mount ympus of Bithynia.

Greeks, indeed, were so much farther advanced in civilisation than the Romans, that it was no easy task for a Roman proconsul to effect any great change in the civil administration. He could not organise his government, without borrowing largely from the existing laws of the province. The constitution of Sicily, which was the first Greek province of the Roman dominions, presents a number of anomalies in the administration of its different districts.[1] That portion of the island which had composed the kingdom of Hiero was allowed to retain its own laws, and paid the Romans the same amount of taxation which had been formerly levied by its own monarchs. The other portions of the island were subjected to various regulations concerning the amount of their taxes, and the administration of justice. The province contained three allied cities, five colonies, five free, and seventeen tributary cities.[2] Macedonia, Epirus, and Achaia, when conquered, were treated very much in the same way, if we make due allowance for the increasing severity of the fiscal government of the Roman magistrates. Macedonia, before it was reduced to the condition of a province, was divided into four districts, each of which was governed by its own magistrates elected by the people. When Achaia was conquered, the walls of the towns were thrown down, the aristocracy was ruined, and the country impoverished by fines. But as soon as the Romans were convinced that Greece was too weak to be dangerous, the Achaians were allowed to revive some of their old civic usages and federal institutions. As the province of Achaia embraced the Peloponnesus, northern Greece, and southern Epirus, the revival of local confederacies, and the privileges accorded to free cities and particular districts, really tended to disunite the Greeks, without affording them the means of increasing their national strength.[3] Crete, Cyprus, Cyrene, and Asia Minor, were subsequently reduced to provinces, and were allowed to retain much of their laws and usages. Thrace, even so late as the time of Tiberius, was governed by its own sovereign, as an ally of the Romans.[4] Many cities within the bounds of the provinces retained their own peculiar laws, and, as far as their own citizens were concerned, they continued to possess the legislative as well as the executive power, by

[1] Niebühr (*Hist. Rome*, iii. 616) gives a sketch of the state of Sicily when it was reduced to a Roman province.

[2] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* iii. 14. *Economie Politique des Romains*, par Dureau de la Malle, ii. 353.

[3] Livy, xlv. 18, 29. Pausanias, viii. 30, 9.

[4] Livy, xlv. 34.

dministering their own affairs, and executing justice within
heir limits, without being liable to the control of the pro-
onsul.[1]

As long as the republic continued to exist, the provinces
ere administered by proconsuls or prætors, chosen from
mong the members of the senate, and responsible to that
ody for their administration. The authority of these pro-
ncial governors was immense; they had the power of life
nd death over the Greeks, and the supreme control over all
udicial, financial, and administrative business, was vested in
heir hands. They had the right of naming and removing
ost of the judges and magistrates under their orders, and
ost of the fiscal arrangements regarding the provincials
epended on their will. No power ever existed more liable to
e abused; for while the representatives of the most absolute
overeigns have seldom been intrusted with more extensive
uthority, they have never incurred so little danger of being
unished for its abuse. The only tribunal before which the
roconsuls could be cited for any acts of injustice which they
ight commit was that very senate which had sent them out
s its deputies, and received them back into its body as
embers.[2]

When the imperial government was consolidated by
ugustus, the command of the whole military force of the
epublic devolved on the emperor; but his constitutional
osition was not that of sovereign. The early emperors con-
entrated in their persons the offices of commander-in-chief of
he military and naval forces of Rome, of minister of war and
f finance, and of Pontifex Maximus, which gave them a
acred character, as head of the religion of the State, and
heir persons were inviolable, as they were invested with the
ribunitian power; but the senate and people were still
ossessed of the supreme legislative authority, and the senate
ontinued to direct the civil branches of the executive ad-
inistration. In consequence of this relation between the
urisdiction of the senate and the emperors, the provinces
ere divided into two classes: those in which the military
orces were stationed were placed under the direct orders of

1 Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* x. 56, 88. Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 78, 80) mentions the existence of small independent principalities with their own troops in the time of Tiberius.

2 Cicero, in many of his orations, recounts deeds of Roman proconsuls and prætors, which surpass in infamy, and equal in cruelty, the worst acts of Turkish pashas. See particularly, *in Verrem; in Pisonem; pro Lege Manilia*.—Arnold's *History of the later Roman Commonwealth*, chap. vii.

the emperor, and were governed by his lieutenants or legates; the other provinces, which did not require to be constantly occupied by the legions, remained dependent on the senate, as the chief civil authority in the State, governed by proconsuls or proprætors. Most of the countries inhabited by the Greeks were in that peaceable condition which placed them in the rank of senatorial provinces. Sicily, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Crete, Cyrene, Bithynia, and Asia Minor, remained under the control of the senate. Cyprus, from its situation as affording a convenient post for a military force to watch Cilicia, Syria, and Egypt, was at first classed among the imperial provinces; but Augustus subsequently exchanged it for the more important position of Dalmatia, where an army could be stationed to watch Rome, and separate Italy and the proconsular provinces of Greece.

The proconsuls and proprætors occupied a higher rank in the State than the imperial legates; the splendour of their courts, and the numerous train by which they were attended, were maintained at the expense of their provinces. Their situation deprived them of all hope of military distinction, the highest object of Roman ambition. This exclusion of the aristocracy from military pursuits, by the emperors, is not to be lost sight of in observing the change which took place in the Roman character. Avarice was the vice which succeeded in stifling their feelings of self-abasement and disappointed ambition; and as the proconsuls were not objects of jealousy to the emperors, they were enabled to gratify their ruling passion without danger. As they were created from among the senate in succession, they felt assured of finding favourable judges under any circumstances. Irresponsible government soon degenerates into tyranny; the administration of the Roman proconsuls soon became as oppressive as that of the worst despots, and was loudly complained of by the provincials. The provinces under the government of the emperor were better administered. The imperial lieutenants, though inferior in rank to proconsuls, possessed a more extensive command, as they united in their persons the chief civil and military authority. The effect of their possessing more power was, that the limits of their authority, and the forms of their proceedings, were determined with greater precision—were more closely watched, and more strictly controlled by the military discipline to which they were subjected; while, at the same time, the constant dependence of all their actions on the

mmediate orders of the emperor, and the various depart-
nents of which he was the head, forbade all arbitrary
roceedings.

The expenses of the proconsular administration were paid
y the provinces, and it was chiefly by abuses augmenting
neir amount that the proconsuls were enabled to accumulate
normous fortunes during their short tenure of government.
'he burden was so heavily felt by Macedonia and Achaia,
ven as early as the reign of Tiberius, that the complaints of
nese two provinces induced that emperor to unite their
dministration with that of the imperial province of Mœsia;
ut Claudius restored them to the senate.[1] Thrace, when it
as reduced to a Roman province by Vespasian, was also
dded to the imperial list. As the power of the emperors
ose into absolute authority over the Roman world, and the
ageant of the republic faded away, all distinction between
ne different classes of provinces disappeared. They were
istributed according to the wish of the reigning emperor, and
neir administration arbitrarily transferred to officers of what-
ver rank he thought fit to select. The Romans, indeed, had
ever affected much system in this, any more than in any
ther branch of their government. Pontius Pilate, when he
ondemned our Saviour, governed Judæa with the rank of
rocurator of Cæsar; he was vested with the whole adminis-
rative, judicial, fiscal, and military authority, almost as com-
letely as it could have been exercised by a proconsul, yet his
tle was only that of a finance officer, charged with the
dministration of those revenues which belonged to the
mperial treasury.

The provincial governors usually named three or four
eputies to carry on the business of the districts into which
ne province was divided, and each of these deputies was con-
olled and assisted by a local council. It may be remarked,
nat the condition of the inhabitants of the western portion of
ne Roman empire was different from that of the eastern; the
eople were generally treated as little better than serfs; they
ere not considered the absolute proprietors of the lands they
ultivated. Adrian first gave them a full right of property in
neir lands, and secured to them a regular system of law. In
reece, on the other hand, the people retained all their
roperty and private rights. A rare exception, indeed,
ccurred in the case of the Corinthian territory, which was

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 76. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.

confiscated for the benefit of the Roman state, and declared *ager publicus* after the destruction of the city by Mummius. Throughout all the countries inhabited by the Greeks, the provincial administration was necessarily modified by the circumstance of the conquered being much farther advanced in social civilisation than their conquerors.[1] To facilitate the task of governing and taxing the Greeks, the Romans found themselves compelled to retain much of the civil government, and many of the financial arrangements, which they found existing; and hence arose the marked difference which is observed in the administration of the eastern and western portions of the empire. When the great jurist Scævola was proconsul of Asia, he published an edict for the administration of his province, by which he allowed the Greeks to have judges of their own nation, and to decide their suits according to their own laws; a concession equivalent to the restoration of their civil liberties in public opinion, according to Cicero, who copied it when he was proconsul of Cilicia.[2] The existence of the free cities, of the local tribunals and provincial assemblies, and the respect paid to their laws, gave the Greek language an official character, and enabled the Greeks to acquire so great an influence in the administration of their country, as either to limit the extent of the despotic power of their Roman masters, or, when that proved impossible, to share its profits.[3] But though the arbitrary decisions of the proconsuls received some check from the existence of fixed rules and permanent usages, still these barriers were insufficient to prevent the abuse of irresponsible authority. Those laws and customs which a proconsul dared not openly violate, he could generally nullify by some concealed measure of oppression. The avidity displayed by Brutus in endeavouring to make Cicero enforce payment of forty-eight per cent interest when his debtors, the Salaminians of Cyprus, offered to pay the capital with twelve per cent interest, proves with what injustice and oppression the Greeks were treated even by the mildest of the Roman aristocracy. The fact that through-

[1] Barthelemy, *Voyage d'Anacharsis*, c. xx. The high state of social civilisation among the Greeks is proved by the existence of societies formed for the purpose of mutual assistance. – Plinii, *Epist.* x. 93, 94. These friendly societies held property. See an inscription in the collection of the Author, published in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, vol. iii. part 2.

[2] Cicero, *Ep. ad Atticum*, vi. 1. Diodorus, *Frag.* xxxv. 8.

[3] Cicero (*Ep. ad Attic.* vi. 2) mentions the extortion of the Greeks magistrates who plundered their fellow-citizens. The politarchs of Thessalonica are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, xvii. 6.

ut the Grecian provinces, as well as in the rest of the empire, he governors superintended the financial administration, and xercised the judicial power, is sufficient to explain the ruin nd poverty which the Roman government produced. Before he wealth of the people had been utterly consumed, an quitable proconsul had it in his power to confer happiness on is provinces, and Cicero draws a very favourable picture f his own administration in Cilicia:[1] but a few governors ike Verres and Caius Antonius soon reduced a province to state of poverty, from which it would have required ages of ood government to enable it to recover. The private letters f Cicero afford repeated proofs that the majority of the fficers employed by the Roman government openly violated very principle of justice to gratify their passions and their varice. Many of them even condescended to engage in rade, and, like Brutus, became usurers.[2]

The early years of the empire were certainly more popular han the latter years of the republic in the provinces. The mperors were anxious to strengthen themselves against the enate by securing the goodwill of the provincials, and they onsequently exerted their authority to check the oppressive onduct of the senatorial officers, and to lighten the fiscal urdens of the people by a stricter administration of justice. 'iberius, Claudius, and Domitian, though Rome groaned nder their tyranny, were remarkable for their zeal in correct- ng abuses in the administration of justice, and Hadrian stablished a council of jurisconsults and senators to assist im in reviewing the judicial business of the provinces as well s of the capital.[3]

Section VI

Fiscal Administration of the Romans

The legal amount of the taxes, direct and indirect, levied y the Romans on the Greeks, was probably not greater than ie sum paid to their national governments in the days of

[1] Cicero, *pro Lege Manilia*, 22; *in Pisonem*, 40. The extortion and cruelty of ius Antonius, the uncle of the triumvir, in Greece and Macedonia, rivalled the ckedness of Verres; but we are not so well acquainted with the details of his sconduct. It is one of the blots on Cicero's reputation that he defended such a man der such circumstances.

[2] Multæ civitates omni ære alieno liberatæ multæ valde levatæ sunt. Omnes suis ibus, et judiciis usæ, αὐτονομίαν adeptæ, revixerunt.—*Ep. ad Att.* vi. 2.

[3] Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 10. Suetonius, *Claud.* xiv. xv.; *Domit.* viii.; *Historiæ Augustæ ript.* Spartianus, *Adrian*, xvii.-xxi.

their independence. But a small amount of taxation arbitrarily imposed, unjustly collected, and injudiciously spent, weighs more heavily on the resources of the people, than immense burdens properly distributed and wisely employed. The wealth and resources of Greece had been greatest at the time when each city formed a separate state, and the inhabitants of each valley possessed the power of employing the taxes which they paid, for objects which ameliorated their own condition. The moment the centralisation of political power enabled one city to appropriate the revenues of another to its wants, whether for its architectural embellishment or for its public games, theatrical representations, and religious ceremonies, the decline of the country commenced: but all the evil effects of centralisation were not felt until the taxes were paid to foreigners.[1] When the tributes were remitted to Rome, it was difficult to persuade absent administrators of the necessity of expending money on a road, a port, or an aqueduct, which had no direct connection with Roman interests. Had the Roman government acted according to the strictest principles of justice, Greece must have suffered from its dominion; but its avarice and corruption, after the commencement of the civil wars, knew no bounds. The extraordinary payments levied on the provinces soon equalled, and sometimes exceeded, the regular and legal taxes. Sparta and Athens, as allied states, were exempt from direct taxation; but, in order to preserve their liberty, they were compelled to make voluntary offerings to the Roman generals, who held the fate of the East in their hands, and these sometimes equalled the amount of any ordinary tribute. Cicero supplies ample proof of the extortions committed by the proconsuls, and no arrangements were adopted to restrain their avarice until the time of Augustus. It is, therefore, only under the empire that any accurate picture of the fiscal administration of the Romans in Greece can be attempted.

Until the time of Augustus, the Romans had maintained their armies by seizing and squandering the accumulated capital hoarded by all the nations of the world. They emptied the treasuries of all the kings and states they conquered: and when Julius Cæsar marched to Rome, he dissipated that portion of the plunder of the world which had been laid up in

[1] The Greek republics appear to have treated their subjects with as much fiscal extortion as Rome treated hers. See Aristotle, *Anonymi Œconomica*, and the complaints of the Lycians against the Rhodians. Livy, xli. 6. Cicero, *ad Atticum*, vi. 2.

the coffers of the republic. When that source of riches was exhausted, Augustus found himself compelled to seek for regular funds for maintaining the army: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."[1] A regular survey of the whole empire was made, and the land-tax was assessed according to a valuation taken of the annual income of every species of property. A capitation-tax was also imposed on all the provincials whom the land-tax did not affect.[2]

The ordinary provincial taxes in the East were this land-tax, which generally amounted to a tenth of the produce, though, in some cases, it constituted a fifth, and in others fell to a twentieth. The land-tax was rendered uniform in all the provinces, and converted at last into a money payment, by Marcus Aurelius. It was not assessed annually: but a valuation was made at stated periods for a determinate number of years, and the annual amount was called the Indictio before the time of Constantine, when the importance of this fiscal measure on the well-being of the inhabitants of the Roman empire is attested by the cycle of indictions becoming the ordinary chronological record of time. Italy itself was subjected to the land-tax and capitation by Galerius, A.D. 306.[3] The subjects of the empire paid also a tax on cattle, and a variety of duties on importation and exportation, which were levied even on the conveyance of goods from one province to another. In Greece, the free cities also retained the right of levying local duties on their citizens. Contributions of provisions and manufactures were likewise exacted for feeding and clothing the troops stationed in the provinces. Even under Augustus, who devoted his personal attention to reforming the financial administration of the empire, the proconsuls and provincial governors ventured to avail themselves of their position, as a means of gratifying their avarice. Licinus accumulated immense riches in Gaul.[4] Tiberius perceived that the weight of the Roman fiscal system was pressing too severely on the provinces, and he rebuked the prefect of

[1] St. Luke ii. 1.

[2] Savigny, *Ueber die Romcische Steuerverfassung unter den Kaisern.—Abhand. Akad. v. Berlin*, 1822. *Economie Politique des Romains*, par Dureau de la Malle, who has most ably explained a remarkable passage of Hyginus.—Vol. i. 177; ii. 418, 434.

[3] Gibbon, chap. xiv. vol. ii. 114; Smith's edit. Savigny, *Abhandlungen der K. Akadêmie von Berlin*, 1822-23, p. 50. See *infra*, p. 127, note 1.

[4] See "Licinus" in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*.

"Marmoreo Licinus tumulo jacet, at Cato parvo,
Pompeius nullo; quis putet esse deos?"

Egypt for remitting too large a sum to Rome, as the amount proved he had overtaxed his province. The mere fact of a prefect's possessing the power of increasing or diminishing the amount of his remittances to the treasury, is enough to condemn the arbitrary nature of the Roman fiscal administration. The prefect was told by the emperor that a good shepherd should shear, not flay, his sheep. But no rulers ever estimated correctly the amount of taxes that their subjects could advantageously pay; and Tiberius received a lesson on the financial system of his empire from Battas, King of Dalmatia, who, on being asked the cause of the rebellion, replied, that it arose from the emperor sending wolves to guard his flocks instead of shepherds.[1]

The financial policy of the Roman republic was to transfer as much of the money circulating in the provinces, and of the precious metals in the hands of private individuals, as it was possible, into the coffers of the State. The city of Rome formed a drain for the wealth of all the provinces, and the whole empire was impoverished for its support. When Caligula expressed the wish that the Roman people had only one neck, in order that he might destroy them all at a single blow, the idea found a responsive echo in many a breast. There was a wise moral in the sentiment uttered in his frenzy; and many felt that the dispersion of the immense pauper population of Rome, which was nourished in idleness by the public revenues, would have been a great benefit to the rest of the empire.[2] The desire of seizing wealth wherever it could be found continued to be long the dominant feeling in the personal policy of the emperors, as well as the proconsuls. The provincial governors enriched themselves by plundering their subjects, and the emperors filled their treasuries by accusing the senators of those crimes which entailed confiscation of their fortunes. From the earliest periods of Roman history, down to the time of Justinian, confiscation of private property was considered an ordinary and important branch of the imperial revenue. When Alexander the Great conquered Asia, the treasures which he dispersed increased the commerce of the world, created new cities, and augmented the general wealth of mankind. The Romans collected far greater riches

[1] Suetonius, *Tiber.* 32. The rapidity with which the provinces were reduced from a state of prosperity to wretchedness is described by Juvenal, *Sat.* viii. 85.

[2] Suet. *Calig.* 30. Caligula was evidently thinking of the sums which would remain for his own extravagance, if he could have eluded furnishing the grain for the public distributions, and the money for maintaining a fixed price in the markets.

rom their conquests than Alexander had done, as they pushed heir exactions much farther; but the rude state of society, in which they lived at the time of their first great successes, prevented their perceiving, that by carrying off or destroying all he movable capital in their conquests, they must ultimately diminish the amount of their own revenues. The wealth brought away from the countries inhabited by the Greeks was ncredible; for the Romans pillaged the conquered, as the Spaniards plundered Mexico and Peru, and ruled them as he Turks subsequently governed Greece. The riches which enturies of industry had accumulated in Syracuse, Tarentum, Epirus, Macedonia, and Greece, and the immense sums seized n the treasuries of the kings of Cyprus, Pergamus, Syria, and Egypt, were removed to Rome, and consumed in a way which virtually converted them into premiums for neglecting agriculture. They were dispersed in paying an immense army, in feeding an idle populace, which was thus withdrawn from all productive occupations, and in maintaining the household of he emperor, the senators, and the imperial freedmen. The consequence of the arrangements adopted for provisioning Rome was felt over the whole empire, and seriously affected he prosperity of the most distant provinces. It is necessary o notice them, in order to understand perfectly the financial ystem of the empire during three centuries.

The citizens of Rome were considered entitled to a share of he revenues of the provinces which they had conquered, and which were long regarded in the light of a landed estate of the epublic. The Roman State was held to be under an obligation of supporting all who were liable to military service, if hey were poor and without profitable employment. The istory of the public distributions of grain, and of the neasures adopted for securing ample supplies to the market, t low prices, form an important chapter in the social and olitical records of the Roman people.[1] An immense quantity f grain was distributed in this way, which was received as ribute from the provinces. Cæsar found three hundred and wenty thousand persons receiving this gratuity. It is true he educed the number one half. The greater part of this grain as drawn from Sicily, Africa, and Egypt. This distribution nabled the poor to live in idleness, and was of itself exemely injurious to industry; while the arrangements adopted

[1] Distributions of grain existed in other states, and at Athens, as early as the time Pericles.—Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 716.

by the Roman government, for selling grain at a low price, rendered the cultivation of land around Rome unprofitable to its proprietors. A large sum was annually employed by the State in purchasing grain in the provinces, and in transporting it to Rome, where it was sold to the bakers at a fixed price. A premium was also paid to the private importers of grain, in order to insure an abundant supply. In this manner a very large sum was expended to keep bread cheap in a city where a variety of circumstances tended to make it dear. This singular system of annihilating capital, and ruining agriculture and industry, was so deeply rooted in the Roman administration, that similar gratuitous distributions of grain were established at Antioch and Alexandria, and other cities, and they were introduced at Constantinople when that city became the capital of the empire.[1]

It is not surprising that Greece suffered severely under a government equally tyrannical in its conduct and unjust in its legislation. In almost every department of public business the interests of the State were placed in opposition to those of the people; even when the letter of the law was mild, its administration was burdensome. The customs of Rome were moderate, and consisted of a duty of five per cent on exports and imports. Where the customs were so reasonable, commerce ought to have flourished; but the real amount levied under an unjust government bears no relation to the nominal payment. The government of Turkey has ruined the commerce of its subjects, with duties equally moderate. The Romans despised commerce; they considered merchants as little better than cheats, and concluded that they were always in the wrong when they sought to avoid making any payment to government. The provinces in the eastern part of the Mediterranean are inhabited by a mercantile population. The wants of many parts can only be supplied by sea; and as the various provinces and small independent states were often separated by double lines of custom-houses, the subsistence of the population was frequently at the mercy of the revenue officers.[2] The customs payable to Rome were let to farmers,

[1] It is curious to find Tacitus praising the establishment of bounties on the importation of foreign grain by Tiberius, without a single word on the evil effects of the system.—*Hist.* iv. 40. He must have traced their consequences.—*Ann.* vi. 13. Naudet *Des Secours Publics chez les Romains. Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France*.—"Inscriptions et Belles-lettres," tome xiii. For the powers granted to Pompey for provisioning Rome, see Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, i. 304. Herodian informs us that Maximinus I. seized the municipal funds, which were set apart in many cities for these distributions.

[2] Cic. *ad Atticum*, ii. 16.

who possessed extensive powers for their collection, and a special tribunal existed for the enforcement of their claims; these farmers of the customs were consequently powerful tyrants in all the countries round the Ægean Sea.

The ordinary duty on the transport of goods from one province to another amounted to two and a half per cent; but some kinds of merchandise were subjected to a tax of an eighth, which appears to have been levied when the article first entered the Roman empire.[1]

The provincial contributions pressed as heavily on the Greeks as the general taxes. The expense of the household of the proconsuls was very great; they had also the right of placing the troops in winter quarters, in whatever towns they thought fit. This power was rendered a profitable means of extorting money from the wealthy districts. Cicero mentions that the island of Cyprus paid two hundred talents—about forty-five thousand pounds annually—in order to purchase exemption from this burden.[2] The power of the fiscal agents, charged to collect the extraordinary contributions in the provinces, was unlimited. One of the ordinary punishments for infringing the revenue laws was confiscation,—a punishment which was converted by the collectors of the revenue into a systematic means of extortion. A regular trade in usury was established, in order to force proprietors to sell their property; and accusations were brought forward in the fiscal courts, merely to levy fines, or compel the accused to incur debts. Free Greeks were constantly sold as slaves because they were unable to pay the amount of taxation to which they were liable. The establishment of posts, which Augustus instituted for the transmission of military orders, was soon converted into a burden to the provinces, instead of being gradually rendered a public benefit, by allowing private individuals to make use of its services. The enlisting of recruits was another source of abuse.[3] Privileges and monopolies were granted to merchants and manufacturers; the industry of a province was ruined, to raise a sum of money for an emperor or a favourite,[4] and we find Trajan himself encouraging fraud by a monopoly.[5]

The free cities and allied states were treated with as much

1 Naudet, *Des Changemens opérés dans toutes les Parties de l'Administration de l'Empire Romain sous les règnes de Dioclétien, de Constantin, et de leurs successeurs, jusqu'à Julien.* 2 vols.
2 *Ep. ad Atticum*, v. 21.
3 Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 18.
4 Lampridius, *in Alex.* p. 122.
5 Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* i. xxv. 3.

injustice as the provinces, though their position enabled them to escape many of the public burdens.[1] The crowns of gold which had once been given by cities and provinces as a testimony of gratitude, were converted into a forced gift, and at last extorted as a tax of a fixed amount.[2]

In addition to the direct weight of the public burdens, their severity was increased by the exemption which Roman citizens enjoyed from the land-tax, the customs, and the municipal burdens, in the provinces, the free cities, and the allied states. This exemption filled Greece with traders and usurers, who obtained the right of citizenship as a speculation, merely to evade the payment of the local taxes. The Roman magistrates had the power of granting this immunity; and as they were in the habit of participating in the profits even of their enfranchised slaves, there can be no doubt that a regular traffic in citizenship was established, and this cause exercised considerable influence in accelerating the ruin of the allied states and free cities, by defrauding them of their local privileges and revenues. When Nero wished to render himself popular in Greece, he extended the immunity from tribute to all the Greeks; but Vespasian found the financial affairs of the empire in such disorder that he was compelled to revoke all grants of exemption to the provinces. Virtue, in the old times of Rome, meant valour; liberty, in the time of Nero, signified freedom from taxation. Of this liberty Vespasian deprived Greece, Byzantium, Samos, Rhodes, and Lycia.[3]

The financial administration of the Romans inflicted, if possible, a severer blow on the moral constitution of society than on the material prosperity of the country. It divided the population of Greece into two classes, one possessing the title of Roman citizens,—a title often purchased by their wealth, and which implied freedom from taxation;—the other consisting of the Greeks who, from poverty, were unable to purchase the envied privilege, and thus by their very poverty were compelled to bear the whole weight of the public burdens laid on the province. The rich and poor were thus ranged in two separate castes of society.

By the Roman constitution, the knights were intrusted with

[1] Diodorus, xxxvi. 1. Juvenal, viii. 107. Tac. *Ann.* xv. 45.

[2] Cic. *in Pis.* 37. The *aurum coronarium* is indicated as a tax in the *Monumentum Ancyranum, Hist. Augustæ Script. Capitolinus, Antonin Pius*, c. 4. [illegible] *Code*, x. 76.

[3] Pausanias, *Achaica*, xvii. 2. Suetonius, *Vesp.* 8. Philostratus, *Apoll. Tyan.* v. 41.

ne management of the finances of the State. They were a ody in whose eyes wealth, on which their rank substantially epended, possessed an undue value. The prominent feature f their character was avarice, notwithstanding the praises of neir justice which Cicero has left us. The knights not only cted as collectors of the revenues, but they also frequently armed the taxes of a province for a term of years, subletting ortions. They formed companies for farming the customs, nd for employing capital in public or private loans. They ere favoured by the policy of Rome; while their own riches, nd their secondary position in political affairs, served to screen hem from attacks in the forum. For a long period, too, all he judges were selected from their order, and consequently nights alone decided those commercial questions which most eriously affected their individual profits.

The heads of the financial administration in Greece were hus placed in a moral position unfavourable to an equitable ollection of the revenues. The case of Brutus, who attempted o oblige the Salaminians of Cyprus to pay him compound nterest, at the rate of four per cent a month, shows that avarice nd extortion were not generally considered dishonourable in he eyes of the Roman aristocracy.[1] The practices of selling he right of citizenship, of raising unjust fiscal prosecutions to extort fines, and enforce confiscation to increase landed estates, ave been already mentioned. They produced effects which ave found a place in history. The existence of all these rimes is well known; their effects may be observed in the act that a single citizen, in the time of Augustus, had already endered himself proprietor of the whole island of Cythera, nd was able to raise a rebellion in Laconia by the severity of is extortions. His name was Julius Eurycles, and the circumstances are mentioned by Strabo.[2] And the island of Cephallenia had been held by Caius Antonius as his private roperty, though he resided there as a criminal banished for extortion.[3]

The Roman citizens in Greece escaped the oppressive powers of the fiscal agents, not only in those cases wherein hey were by law exempt from the payment of the provincial axes, but also because they possessed the means of defending hemselves against injustice by the right of carrying their causes to Rome for judgment by appeal. These privileges soon rendered the number of Roman citizens engaged in

[1] Cic. *ad Att.* v. 22; vi. 1. [2] Strabo, viii. c. vi. [3] Strabo, x. c. 2.

mercantile speculation and trade very great in Greece. A considerable multitude of the inhabitants of Rome had, from the earliest times, been employed in trade and commerce, without obtaining the right of citizenship at home. They did not fail to settle in numbers in all the Roman conquests, and, in the provinces, they were correctly called Romans. They always enjoyed from the republic the fullest protection, and soon acquired the rights of citizenship. Even the Roman citizens were sometimes so numerous in the provinces that they could furnish not a few recruits to the legions.[1] Their numbers were so great at the commencement of the Mithridatic war (B.C. 88) that eighty thousand were put to death in Asia when the king took up arms against the Romans. The greater part undoubtedly consisted of merchants, traders, and money-dealers. The Greeks at last obtained the right of Roman citizenship in such multitudes, that Nero may have made no very enormous sacrifice of public revenue when he conferred liberty, or freedom from tribute, on all the Greeks.

It is unnecessary to dwell at any length on the effects of the extensive system of general oppression and partial privileges which has been described. Honest industry was useless in trade, and political intrigue was the easiest mode of making a large fortune, even in commerce. A rapid decline in the wealth of Greece, and a great diminution in the numbers of the population, took place. So early as the time of Augustus many of the richest cities of Greece were in a ruinous condition, some of the most fertile regions depopulated, and the inexhaustible supply of wealth, which the Romans supposed they would find in the provinces, began to fail.[2]

Section VII

Depopulation of Greece caused by the Roman Government

Experience proves that the same law of the progress of society which gives to an increasing population a tendency to outgrow the means of subsistence, compels a declining on to press on the limits of taxation. A government may pus

[1] Cicero, *ad Att.* v. 18.

[2] Sallust says, "Omnibus modis pecuniam trahunt, vexant; tamen summa libidine divitias suas vincere nequeunt." Cicero, *ad Fam.* xv. 1. Strabo gives many instances of depopulation of Greece.—viii.; vol. ii. pp. 185, 190, 216, 226; ix. pp. 251, 294; x. p. 346; edit. Tauch.

axation up to that point when it arrests all increase in the neans of subsistence; but the moment this stationary con- lition of society is produced, the people will begin to consume portion of the wealth previously absorbed by the public axes, and the revenues of the country will have a tendency to lecrease; or, what is the same thing in so far as the political aw is concerned, the government will find greater difficulty in ollecting the same amount of revenue, and, if it succeed, vill cause a diminution in the population.

The depopulation of the Roman provinces was, however, ot caused entirely by the financial oppression of the govern- nent. In order to secure new conquests against rebellion, he armed population was generally exterminated, or reduced o slavery. If the people displayed a spirit of independence, hey were regarded as robbers, and destroyed without mercy; nd this cruelty was so engrafted into the system of the Roman administration that Augustus treated the Salassi in his manner, when their disorders could easily have been ffectually prevented by milder measures.[1] At the time the Romans first engaged in war with the Macedonians and Greeks, the contest was of so doubtful a nature that the Romans were not likely to relax the usual policy which they dopted for weakening their foes; Macedonia, Epirus, Ætolia, nd Achaia, were therefore treated with the greatest severity t the time of their conquest. Æmilius Paulus, in order to ecure the submission of Epirus, destroyed seventy cities, and old one hundred and fifty thousand of the inhabitants as laves. The policy which considered a reduction of the opulation necessary for securing obedience, would not fail to dopt efficient measures to prevent its again becoming either umerous or wealthy. The utter destruction of Carthage, and he extermination of the Carthaginians, is a fact which has no arallel in the history of any other civilised state.[2] Mummius azed Corinth to the ground, and sold its whole population as laves. Delos was the great emporium of the trade of the East about the time of the conquest of Greece; it was lundered by the troops of Mithridates, and again by the rders of Sylla. It only recovered its former state of pros- erity under the Romans as a slave-market. Sylla utterly estroyed several cities of Bœotia, and depopulated Athens,

[1] Strabo, iv. Suetonius, *Aug.* 21. The inhabitants of the valley of Aosta, of whom 5,000 were sold as slaves.

[2] Livy, xlv. 34. Diodorus, xxxi. Plutarch, *Æmilius Paulus.*

the Piræus, and Thebes.[1] The inhabitants of Megara were nearly exterminated by Julius Cæsar; and a considerable number of the cities of Achaia, Ætolia, and Acarnania, were laid waste by order of Augustus, that their inhabitants might be compelled to dwell in the newly established Roman colonies of Nicopolis and Patras.[2] Brutus levied five years' tribute in advance from the inhabitants of Asia Minor. His severity made the people of Xanthus prefer extermination to submission. Cassius, after he had taken Rhodes, treated it in the most tyrannical manner, and displayed a truly Roman spirit of fiscal rapacity.[3] The celebrated letter of Sulpicius to Cicero, so familiar to the lovers of poetry from the paraphrase of Lord Byron, affords irrefragable testimony to the rapid decline of Greece under the Roman government.

Greece suffered very severely during the civil wars. The troops which she still possessed were compelled to range themselves on one side or the other. The Ætolians and Acarnanians joined Cæsar; the Athenians, Lacedæmonians, and Bœotians, ranged themselves as partisans of Pompey. The Athenians, and most of the other Greeks, afterwards espoused the cause of Brutus and Cassius; but the Lacedæmonians sent a body of two thousand men to serve as auxiliaries to Octavius. The destruction of property caused by the progress through Greece of the various bodies of troops, whose passions were inflamed by the disorders of the civil war, was not compensated by the favours conferred on a few cities by Cæsar, Antony, and Augustus. The remission of a few taxes, or the present of additional revenues to an oligarchical magistracy, could exercise no influence on the general prosperity of the country.

The depopulation caused by war alone might have been very soon repaired, had the government of Greece been wisely administered. Yet Attica appears never to have recovered from the ravages committed by Philip V. of Macedon as early as the year B.C. 200, when he burned down the buildings and groves of Cynosarges and the Lyceum in the immediate

[1] See pages 46, 47.

[2] Though we have no picture, by a contemporary, of the misery which Augustus caused in Greece, still we can imagine it to have been severe from the manner in which he treated Italy. He seized the property of the inhabitants of eighteen of the richest cities, and divided the lands amongst his soldiers. The soldiers extended their invasions to the possessions of other cities; and Virgil has immortalised their encroachments and robberies. Augustus must have settled nearly 160,000 men in his various military colonies, which were generally formed by confiscating the lands of the lawful proprietors.—Appian, *Bell. Civ.* v. 5, 13, 22.

[3] Appian, *Bell. Civ.* iv. 65, 81. Brutus promised his soldiers the sack of Thessalonica and Sparta, if they proved victorious at Philippi.

icinity of Athens, and the temples, olive-trees, and vineyards, ver the whole country.[1] The Athenians had even then lost he social and moral energy necessary for repairing the amage produced by a great national calamity. They could o longer pursue a life of agricultural employment: their ondition had degenerated into that of a mere city population, nd the thoughts and feelings of Greek freemen were those of town mob. In such circumstances the ravages of an enemy ermanently diminished the resources of the country, for in a and like Greece, ages of labour, and the accumulated savings f generations, are required to make the arid limestone nountains capable of yielding considerable supplies of food, o cover them with olive and fig trees, and to construct isterns and canals of irrigation.[2] In Athens bad government, ocial corruption, literary presumption, and national conceit, ere nourished by liberal donations from foreign princes, who epaid base flattery by feeding a worthless city population. ervility became more productive than honest industry. This egradation of honest labour, and the depopulation of the ountry which resulted from it, continued when Greece njoyed peace under the domination of Rome. The statues f the gods erected in temples which had fallen into ruins, culptured dedications and marble tombs, monuments of a ealthy and dense rural population of free citizens in the gricultural demes of Attica, were seen in the times of Hadrian, s the turbaned tombstone may now be seen in Turkey near he solitary desolation of the ruined mosque, testifying the apid depopulation and destruction of vested capital which s now going on in the Othoman empire. A Roman writer ays, that in Attica there were more gods and heroes than iving men. It is impossible to point out, in precise detail, ll the various measures by which the Roman administration ndermined the physical and moral strength of the Greek ation; it is sufficient to establish the fact, that too much was xacted from the body of the people in the shape of public urdens, and that the neglect of all its duties on the part of he government gradually diminished the productive resources f the country. While no useful public works were repaired, ands of robbers were allowed to infest the provinces for long eriods without molestation. The extortions of the Roman nagistrates, however, were more injurious, and rendered

[1] Livy, xxxi. 24.
[2] Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, ii. 381.—On the population of ancient Greece.

property more insecure, than the violence of the banditti. The public acts of robbery are those only which have been preserved by history; but for each open attack on public property, hundreds of private families were reduced to poverty, and thousands of free Greeks sold as slaves. Fulvius despoiled the temples of Ambracia of their most valuable ornaments, and even carried away the statues of the gods.[1] Verres, on his passage through Greece to his post in Cilicia, carried off a quantity of gold from the temple of Minerva at Athens.[2] Piso, while proconsul of Macedonia, plundered both it and Greece, and left both to be ravaged by Thracian banditti.[3] Even under the cautious and conciliatory administration of Augustus, the oppressive conduct of the Romans caused seditions, both in Laconia—which was a favoured district, from its having taken part with the emperor against Antony—and in Attica, where the weakness to which the city was reduced seemed to render any expression of discontent impossible.[4] The Greeks had not, in the time of Augustus, entirely lost their ancient spirit and valour, and though comparatively feeble, their conduct was an object of some solicitude to the Roman government.

The moral causes of depopulation were perhaps even more powerful than the political. They had been long in operation, and had produced great changes in the Greek character before the Roman conquest; and as some similar social evils were acting on the Romans themselves, the moral condition of Greece was not improved by the Roman government. The most prevalent evil was a spirit of self-indulgence and utter indifference to the duty of man in private life, which made every rank averse to marriage, and unwilling to assume the responsibility of educating a family. The Greeks never adorned the vestibules of their houses with the statues and busts of their ancestors; their inordinate self-conceit taught them to concentrate their admiration on themselves. And the Romans, even with the family pride which led to this noble practice, were constantly losing the glories of their race by conferring their name on adopted scions of other houses. The religion, and often the philosophy, of the ancients encouraged vicious indulgence, and the general rule of society

[1] B.C. 189. Livy, xxxviii. 43.

[2] Verres compelled a single city in Sicily to pay 34,000 medimni of wheat to one of his favourites.—Cic. *in Ver.* ii. 1, 17, 44.

[3] Cic. *in Pisonem*, 17, 34, 40; *pro Font.* 16.

[4] Strabo, *Laconia*, vol. ii., pp. 186, 190; edit. Tauch. Ahrens, *De Athenarum statu politico*, &c., 12, and his authorities.

n the first century of the Roman empire, was to live with concubines selected from a class of female slaves educated for this station. The land, which had formerly maintained a thousand free citizens capable of marching to defend their country as hoplites, was now regarded as affording a scanty provision for the household of a single proprietor who considered himself too poor to marry. His estate was cultivated by a tribe of slaves, while he amused himself with the music of the theatre, or the equally idle sounds of the philosophic schools. The desire of the population to occupy larger properties than their ancestors had cultivated, has already been noticed as an effect of the riches obtained by the Macedonian conquests; and its influence as a moral check on the amount of the population of Greece has been adverted to.[1] This powerful cause of depopulation increased under the Roman government. The love of immense parks, splendid villas, and luxurious living, fostered vice and celibacy to such an extent in the higher ranks, that the wealthy families of the empire became gradually extinct. The line of distinction between the rich and the poor was constantly becoming more marked. The rich formed an aristocratic class, the poor were sinking towards a dependent grade in society; they were fast approaching the state of *coloni* or serfs. In this state of society, neither class shows a tendency to increase. It appears indeed to be a law of human society, that all classes of mankind which are separated, by superior wealth and privileges, from the body of the people, are, by their oligarchical constitution, liable to a rapid decline. As the privileges which they enjoy have created an unnatural position in life, vice is increased beyond that limit which is consistent with the duration of society. The fact has been long observed with regard to the oligarchies of Sparta and Rome. It had its effect even on the more extended citizenship of Athens, and it even affected, in our times, the two hundred thousand electors who formed the oligarchy of France during the reign of Louis Philippe.[2]

1 See page 36.

2 Arist. *De Rep.* ii. vi. 12. Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 8. The numerous admissions of new citizens at Athens are mentioned by Dureau de la Malle (*Economie Politique des Romains*, i. 419), who has the following passage concerning the electors in France (i. 417): "Ainsi, à Paris, où il règne plus d'aisance que dans le reste du royaume, la moyenne des enfants par ménage n'est que de $3\frac{1}{3}$, nombre insuffisant pour maintenir la population au même niveau, puisque à vingt ans la moitié des enfants a péri avant de se marier. Si l'on prend la même moyenne sur les 200,000 électeurs, elle se trouve encore plus faible; cependant la population totale augmente par an de $\frac{1}{170}$."

Section VIII

ROMAN COLONIES ESTABLISHED IN GREECE

Two Roman colonies, Corinth and Patras, were established in Greece, which soon became the principal cities, and were for ages the centres of the political administration. Their influence on Greek society was very great, yet Latin continued to be the spoken language of the inhabitants, and their institutions and local government remained Roman until the decree of Caracalla extended the Roman franchise to all Greece.

The site of Corinth had been devoted to the gods when Mummius destroyed the city and exterminated its inhabitants. From that time it remained desolate until Julius Cæsar repeopled it with a colony of Romans. The advantages of its position, its rich territory, its impregnable citadel, its narrow isthmus, and its ports on two seas, made it equally valuable as a military and naval station, and as a commercial mart. Cæsar refortified the Acro-Corinth, repaired the temples, rebuilt the city, restored the ports, and established a numerous population of veteran legionaries and industrious freedmen in the new city. Corinth became once more flourishing and populous. Its colonial coinage from the time of Julius to that of Gordian III. is abundant, and often beautiful. It attests the extent of its trade and the taste of its inhabitants. But the new Corinth was not a Greek city. The mother of so many Hellenic colonies was now a foreign colony in Hellas. Her institutions were Roman, her language was Latin, her manners were tinctured with the lupine ferocity of the race of Romulus. Shows of gladiators were the delight of her amphitheatre; and though she shed a strong light over fallen Greece, it was only a lurid reflection of the splendour of Rome.[1]

The position of Corinth was admirably suited for a military station to overlook the proceedings of the Greeks who were opposed to Cæsar's government. The measure was evidently one of precaution, and very little was done to give it the show of having originated in a wish to revive the prosperity of Greece. The population of the new Corinth was allowed to collect building materials, and search for wealth, in any way,

[1] "Totius Græciæ lumen."—Cicero.

ow offensive soever it might be to the feelings of the Greeks. he tombs, which had alone escaped the fury of Mummius, ere destroyed to construct the new buildings, and excavated r the rich ornaments and valuable sepulchral vases which ey often contained. So systematically did the Romans ursue this profession of violating the tombs, that it became a ource of very considerable wealth to the colony, and Rome as filled with works of archaic art.[1] The facilities which the sition of Corinth afforded for maritime communications, ot only with every part of Greece, but also with Italy and sia Minor, rendered it the seat of the Roman provincial lministration, and the usual residence of the proconsul of chaia.[2]

The policy of Augustus towards Greece was openly one of ecaution. The Greeks still continued to occupy the atten- on of the ruling class at Rome, more perhaps than their clining power warranted; they had not yet sunk into the olitical insignificancy which they were destined to reach in e days of Juvenal and Tacitus. Augustus reduced the wer of all those Greek states that retained any influence, hether they had joined his own party or favoured Antony. thens was deprived of its authority over Eretria and Egina, id forbidden to increase its local revenues by selling the ght of citizenship.[3] Lacedæmon was also weakened by the tablishment of the independent community of the free aconians, a confederation of twenty-four maritime cities, hose population, consisting chiefly of *perioikoi*, had hitherto id taxes to Sparta. Augustus, it is true, assigned the island Cythera, and a few places on the Messenian frontier, to the acedæmonian state; but the gift was a very slight compen- tion for the loss sustained in a political point of view, what- er it might have been in a financial.

Augustus established a Roman colony at Patras to extin- ish the smouldering nationality of Achaia, and to keep en a gate through which a Roman force might at any time ur into Greece. Patras then lay in ruins, and the pro- ietors of its territory dwelt in the villages around. Augustus paired the city, and repeopled it with Roman citizens, eedmen, and the veterans of the twenty-second legion. To l up the void in the numbers of the middle and lower

[1] Strabo, viii. 6. Yet the tombs in the Corinthian territory even now frequently ld considerable booty to excavators.

[2] *Theodos. Cod.* ix. 1, 2.

[3] See p. 47, note 1.

orders of the free population, necessary for the immediate formation of a large city, the inhabitants of some neighbouring Greek towns were compelled to abandon their dwellings and reside in Patras. The local government of the colony was endowed with municipal revenues taken from several Achaian and Locrian cities which were deprived of their civic existence. Patras was often the residence of the proconsul of Achaia, and it flourished for ages both as a Roman administrative station and as a port possessing great commercial resources. Its colonial coinage, though neither so abundant nor so elegant in its fabric as that of Corinth, extends from the time of Augustus to that of Gordian III. As in all Roman colonies, the political institutions of Rome were closely imitated at Corinth and Patras. Their highest magistrates were duumviri, who represented the consulate, and who were annually elected; or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say, were selected for a nominal election by the imperial authorities. Other magistrates were elected, and some were appointed to perform those duties in the colonies which were similar to the functions of the great office-bearers in Rome. And as the model of the Roman government was originally that of a single city, the resemblance was easily maintained. Under the emperors, however, the colonies gradually sank into ordinary corporations for the transaction of administrative and fiscal business, under the immediate control of the Roman proconsuls and provincial governors.[1]

Augustus also founded a new city called Nicopolis, to commemorate the victory of Actium, but it was as much a triumphal monument as a political establishment. Its organisation was that of a Greek city, not of a Roman colony; and its quinquennial festival of the Actia was instituted on the model of the great games of Greece, and placed under the superintendence of the Lacedæmonians. Its population consisted of Greeks compelled to desert their native cities in Epirus, Acarnania, and Ætolia. Its territory was extensive, and it was admitted into the Amphictyonic council as a Greek state.[2] The manner in which Augustus peopled Nicopolis proves his indifference to the feelings of humanity, and the imperfection of his knowledge in that political science

[1] A coin of Hadrian in second brass, from the mint of Corinth, commemorates the Concordia of Corinth and Patras; but it is not easy to decide what mutual privileges were thereby conceded. The coin is in the small collection of the Author.

[2] Tacitus (*Ann.* v. 10), in calling Nicopolis a Roman colony, evidently does not intend to say more than that it was a colony of Greeks founded by the Romans.

which enables a statesman to convert a small territory into a flourishing State.

The principles of his colonisation contributed as directly to the decline and depopulation of Italy and Greece, as the accidental tyranny or folly of any of his successors. The inhabitants of a great part of Ætolia were torn from their abodes, where they were residing on their own property, surrounded by their cattle, their olive-trees and vineyards, and compelled to construct such dwellings as they were able, and find such means of livelihood as presented themselves, at Nicopolis. The destruction of an immense amount of vested capital in provincial buildings was the consequence; the agriculture of a whole province was ruined, and the population must have soon died away, in the poverty which they would experience under the change of a city life. Nicopolis long continued to be the principal city in Epirus. Its local coinage extends from Augustus down to the reign of Gallienus. The legends are Greek, and the fabric rude.[1] The peculiar privileges conferred on the three colonies of Corinth, Patras, and Nicopolis, and the close connection in which they were placed with the imperial government, enabled them to flourish for centuries amidst the general poverty which the despotic system of the Roman provincial administration spread over the rest of Greece.[2]

Section IX

Political Condition of Greece from the Time of Augustus to that of Caracalla

Two descriptions of Greece have been preserved, which afford vivid pictures of the impoverished condition of the country during two centuries of the Roman government. Strabo has left us an account of the depopulated aspect of Greece, shortly after the foundation of the colonies of Patras and Nicopolis. Pausanias has described, with melancholy exactness, the desolate appearance of many celebrated cities, during the time of the Antonines.[3] Governors and proconsuls were sent to administer the government of Greece who

[1] In the latter half of the fourth century, the greater part of Nicopolis was the property of Paula, one of the Roman ladies celebrated for her devotion to St. Jerome. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, i. 73.

[2] Pausanias, *Eliac. Pr.* xxiii. 2; *Phoc.* xxxviii. 2; *Achaica*, xviii. 6.

[3] The *Eliacs* of Pausanias were written A.D. 173. Leake's *Topography of Athens and Attica*—Introduction.

were ignorant of the Greek language.[1] The taxes imposed on the country, and the burden of the provincial administration, drained off all the wealth of the people; and those necessary public works, which required a large expenditure for their maintenance and preservation, were allowed to deteriorate and fall gradually into ruin. The emperors, at times, indeed, attempted, by a few isolated acts of mercy, to alleviate the sufferings of the Greeks. Tiberius, as we have already mentioned, united the provinces of Achaia and Macedonia to the imperial government of Mœsia, in order to deliver them from the weight of the proconsular administration.[2] His successor restored them to the senate. When Nero visited Greece to receive a crown at the Olympic games, he recompensed the Greeks for flattering his music by declaring them free from tribute. The immunities which he conferred produced some serious disputes between the various states, concerning the collection of their municipal taxes; and Vespasian rendered these disputes a pretext for annulling the freedom conferred by Nero.[3] The free cities of Greece still possessed not only the administration of considerable revenues, but also the power of raising money, by local taxes, for the maintenance of their temples, schools, universities, aqueducts, roads, ports, and public buildings. Trajan carefully avoided destroying any of the municipal privileges of the Greeks, and he endeavoured to improve their condition by his just and equitable administration; yet his policy was adverse to the increase of local institutions.[4]

Hadrian opened a new line of policy to the sovereigns of Rome, and avowed the determination of reforming the institutions of the Romans, and adapting his government to the altered state of society in the empire. He perceived that the central government was weakening its power, and diminishing its resources, by acts of injustice, which rendered property everywhere insecure. He remedied the evils which resulted from the irregular dispensation of the laws by the provincial governors, and effected reforms which certainly exercised a favourable influence on the condition of the inhabitants of the provinces. His reign laid the foundation of that regular and systematic administration of justice in the Roman empire, which gradually absorbed all the local judicatures of the

[1] Philostratus, *Apoll. Vit.* v. 36. [2] Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 76, 80.
[3] Pausanias, *Ach.* xvii. 2. Philostratus, *Apoll. Tyan.* v. 14.
[4] Pliny, *Epist.* x. 23, 43, 94, 97.

Greeks, and, by forming a numerous and well-educated society of lawyers, guided by uniform rules, raised up a partial barrier against arbitrary power. In order to lighten the weight of taxation, Hadrian abandoned all the arrears of taxes accumulated in preceding years.[1] His general system of administrative reforms was pursued by the Antonines, and perfected by the edict of Caracalla, which conferred the rank of Roman citizens on all the free inhabitants of the empire. Hadrian certainly deserves the merit of having first seen the necessity of securing the imperial government, by effacing the badges of servitude from the provincials, and connecting the interests of the majority of the landed proprietors throughout the Roman empire, with the existence of the imperial administration. He was the first who laid aside the prejudices of a Roman, and secured to the provincials that legal rank in the constitution of the empire which placed their rights on a level with those of Roman citizens, and for this he was hated by the senate.

Hadrian, from personal taste, cultivated Greek literature, and admired Grecian art. He left traces of his love of improvement in every portion of the empire, through which he kept constantly travelling; but Greece, and especially Attica, received an extraordinary share of the imperial favour. It is difficult to estimate how far his conduct immediately affected the general well-being of the population, or to point out the precise manner of its operation on society; but it is evident that the impulse given to improvement by his example and his administration, produced some tendency to ameliorate the condition of the Greeks. Greece had, perhaps, sunk to its lowest state of poverty and depopulation under the financial administration of the Flavian family, and it enjoyed the advantage of good government under Hadrian. The extraordinary improvements which the Roman emperors might have effected in the empire, by a judicious employment of the public revenues, may be estimated from the immense public works executed by Hadrian. At Athens he completed the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which had been commenced by Pisistratus, and of which sixteen columns still exist to astonish the spectator by their size and beauty.[2] He built temples to

[1] Spartianus, *in Adriano*, p. 10.

[2] Since this passage was written, one of the columns of the temple of Jupiter Olympius was blown down in a hurricane during the month of October, 1852. The fine substructure beneath the soil appeared to have received some injury in modern times.

Juno and to Jupiter Panhellenius, and ornamented the city with a magnificent pantheon, a library, and a gymnasium. He commenced an aqueduct to convey an abundant stream of water from Cephisia, which was completed by Antoninus. At Megara, he rebuilt the temple of Apollo. He constructed an aqueduct which conveyed the waters of the lake Stymphalus to Corinth, and he erected new baths in that city. But the surest proof that his improvements were directed by a judicious spirit is to be found in his attention to the roads. Nothing could tend more to advance the prosperity of this mountainous country than removing the difficulties of intercourse between its various provinces; for there is no country where the expense of transport presents a greater barrier to trade, or where the difficulty of internal communications forms a more serious impediment to improvement in the social condition of the agricultural population. He rendered the road from Northern Greece to the Peloponnesus, by the Scironian rocks, easy and commodious for wheeled carriages. Great, however, as these improvements were, he conferred one still greater on the Greeks, as a nation, by commencing the task of moulding their various local customs and laws into one general system, founded on the basis of the Roman jurisprudence;[1] and while he ingrafted the law of the Romans on the stock of society in Greece, he did not seek to destroy the municipal institutions of the people. The policy of Hadrian, in raising the Greeks to an equality of civil rights with the Romans, sanctioned whatever remained of the Macedonian institutions throughout the East; and as soon as the edict of Caracalla had conferred on all the subjects of the empire the rights of Roman citizenship, the Greeks became, in reality, the dominant people in the Eastern portion of the Roman empire, and Greek institutions ultimately ruled society under the supremacy of Roman law.

It is curious that Antoninus, who adopted all the views of Hadrian with regard to the annihilation of the exclusive supremacy of the Roman citizens, should have thought it worth his attention to point out the supposed ancient connection between Rome and Arcadia. He was the first Roman who commemorated this fanciful relationship between Greece and Rome by any public act. He conferred on Palantium, the Arcadian city from which Evander was supposed to have led a Greek colony to the banks of the Tiber, all the privileges

[1] Spanheim, *Orbis Romanus*, p. 393.

ver granted to the most favoured municipalities in the Roman mpire. The habits and character of Marcus Aurelius led him o regard the Greeks with the greatest favour; and had his eign been more peaceful, and left his time more at his own isposal, the sophists and philosophers of Greece would, in all robability, have profited by his leisure. He rebuilt the temple f Eleusis, which had been burnt to the ground; he improved he schools of Athens, and increased the salaries of the pro-essors, who then rendered that city the most celebrated niversity in the civilised world. Herodes Atticus, whose plendid public edifices in Greece rivalled the works of Hadrian, gained great influence by his eminence in literature nd taste, as well as by his enormous wealth. It was the olden age of rhetoricians, whose services to the public were ewarded not only with liberal salaries and donations in oney, but even with such magisterial authority and honour s the Greek cities could confer. Herodes Atticus had been elected by Antoninus Pius to give lessons in eloquence to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and he had been always reated with distinction by Marcus Aurelius, until the emperor elt it was a duty to punish his oppressive and tyrannical con-uct to the Athenians. The friendship of the emperor did ot save him from disgrace, though his freedmen alone were unished.[1]

Little can be collected concerning the condition of Greece nder the successors of Marcus Aurelius. The Roman overnment was occupied with wars, which seldom directly ffected the provinces occupied by the Greeks. Literature nd science were little regarded by the soldiers of fortune who ounted the imperial throne; and Greece, forgotten and neg-cted, appears to have enjoyed a degree of tranquillity and epose, which enabled her to profit by the improvements in he imperial government which Hadrian had introduced and he decree of Caracalla had ratified.[2]

The institutions of the Greeks, which were unconnected ith the exercise of the supreme executive power in the ountry, were generally allowed to exist, even by the most alous of the emperors. When these institutions disappeared, eir destruction was effected by the progressive change which me gradually introduced into Greek society, and not by any

[1] Philostratus, *Vitæ Soph.* ii. 12, 13. See also the Memoir on the life of Herodes ticus by de Burigny, in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, tome xxx.
[2] A.D. 212–217.

violence on the part of the Roman government. It is difficult, indeed, to trace the limits of the state and city administration in matters of taxation, or the exact extent of their control over their local funds. Some cities possessed independence, and others were free from tribute; and these privileges gave the Greek nation a political position in the empire, which prevented their being confounded with the other provincials in the East, until the reign of Justinian.[1] As the Greek cities in Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, preserved these important privileges, it is not wonderful that, in Greece, the whole frame of the ancient social institutions was preserved.[2]

Pausanias found the Amphictyonic council still holding its meetings, three centuries after the Roman conquest.[3] The deputies of the Achaian, Bœotian, and Phocic commonwealths, continued to meet for the purpose of transacting the business of their confederacies.[4] The Athenians were allowed to maintain an armed guard in the island of Delos.[5] The Olympic, Pythic, and Isthmian games were regularly celebrated.[6] The Areopagus at Athens, and the Gerontia at Sparta, still exercised their functions.[7] The different cities and provinces affected the use of their peculiar dialects, and the inhabitants of Sparta continued to imitate the Laconism of antiquity in their public despatches, though their altered manners rendered it ridiculous.[8] The mountaineers of Attica, in the time of Antoninus, spoke a purer language than the populace of the city of Athens, which still bore evidence of its heterogeneous origin after the massacre of Sylla.[9] Had the financial burdens of the Roman government not weighed too heavily on the population, the rivalry of the Greeks, actively directed to local improvements and to commerce, instead of being too exclusively and ostentatiously devoted to philosophy, literature, and the arts, might have proved more useful and honourable to their country. But the moral supports of the old framework of society were destroyed

1 Αὐτονομία was the privilege of some cities, others were ἀτελεῖς φορῶν.

2 The assemblies of the people in the Greek cities were, however, regarded by the Romans with great jealousy: Acts xix. 40, "For we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar, there being no cause whereby we may give an account of this concourse." Even Trajan felt some fear or jealousy of the influence of local organisation in the Greek cities.—Pliny, *Epist.* lib. x. 43, 94.

3 *Phoc.* viii. 2.
4 *Achaica*, xvi. 7; *Bœot.* xxxiv. 1; *Phoc.* iv. 2.
5 *Arcad.* xxxiii.
6 *Eliac. Pr.* vii. 4; *Phoc.* vii. 2; *Corinth.* ii. 2.
7 *Attica*, xxviii. 5; *Facon.* xi. 2.
8 Strabo, viii. 1; vol. ii. 138; edit. Tauch. Paus. *Messen.* xxvii. 5. Philostratus, *Apoll. Tyan.* ii. 62.
9 Philostratus, *Vit. Soph*, Herod. Att. Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 55. "Conluviem illam nationum."—Dio. 54, 7.

before the edict of Caracalla had emancipated Greece; and when tranquillity arrived, they were only capable of enjoying the felicity of having been forgotten by their tyrants.

Section X

The Greeks and Romans never showed any disposition to unite and form one people

The habits and tastes of the Greeks and Romans were so different, that their familiar intercourse produced a feeling of antipathy in the two nations. The Roman writers, from prejudice and jealousy, of which they were themselves, perhaps, unconscious, have transmitted to us a very incorrect picture of the state of the Greeks during the first centuries of the empire. They did not observe, with attention, the marked distinction between the Asiatic and Alexandrine Greeks, and the natives of Hellas. The European population, pursuing the quiet life of landed proprietors, or engaged in the pursuits of commerce and agriculture, was considered, by Roman prejudice, as unworthy of notice. Lucian, himself a Greek, indeed contrasts the tranquil and respectable manner of life at Athens with the folly and luxury of Rome;[1] but the Romans looked on provincials as little better than serfs (*coloni*), and merchants were, in their eyes, only tolerated cheats. The Greek character was estimated from the conduct of the adventurers, who thronged from the wealthy and corrupted cities of the East to seek their fortunes at Rome, and who, from motives of fashion and taste, were unduly favoured by the wealthy aristocracy.[2] The most distinguished of these Greeks were literary men, professors of philosophy, rhetoric, grammar, mathematics, and music. Great numbers were engaged as private teachers; and this class was regarded with some respect by the Roman nobility, from its intimate connection with their families. The great mass of the Greeks residing at Rome were, however, employed in connection with the public and private amusements of the capital, and were found engaged in every profession, from the directors of the theatres and opera-houses, down to the swindlers who frequented the haunts of vice. The

1 *Nigrinus*, tom. i. 21; edit. Tauch.

2 "Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes,
Augur, schœnobates, medicus, magus; omnia novit.
Græculus esuriens, in cœlum jusseris, ibit."
Juvenal, *Sat.* iii. 76

testimony of the Latin authors may be received as sufficiently accurate concerning the light in which the Greeks were regarded at Rome, and as a not incorrect portraiture of the Greek population of the capital.[1]

The expressions of the Romans, when speaking of the Greeks, often display nothing more than the manner in which the proud aristocracy of the empire regarded all foreigners, those even whom they admitted to their personal intimacy. The Greeks were confounded with the great body of strangers from the Eastern nations, in one general sentence of condemnation; and not unnaturally, for the Greek language served as the ordinary means of communication with all foreigners from the East. The magicians, conjurers, and astrologers of Syria, Egypt, and Chaldæa, were naturally mixed up, both in society and public opinion, with the adventurers of Greece, and contributed to form the despicable type which was unjustly enough transferred from the fortune-hunters at Rome to the whole Greek nation. It is hardly necessary to observe that Greek literature, as cultivated at Rome during this period, had no connection with the national feelings of the Greek people. As far as the Greeks themselves were concerned, learning was an honourable and lucrative occupation to its successful professors; but in the estimation of the higher classes at Rome, Greek literature was merely an ornamental exercise of the mind,—a fashion of the wealthy.[2] This ignorance of Greece and the Greeks induced Juvenal to draw his conclusive proof of the utter falsity of the Greek character, and of the fabulous nature of all Greek history, from his own doubts concerning a fact which is avouched by the testimony of Herodotus and Thucydides; but as a retort to the *Græcia mendax* of the Roman satirist, the apter observation of Lucian may be cited—that the Romans spoke truth only once in their lives, and that was when they made their wills.[3]

The Greeks repaid the scorn of the Romans with greater and not more reasonable contempt. When the two nations first came into collision, the Romans were certainly far less

[1] Tacitus, *Hist.* iii. 47, mentions the "desidiam licentiamque Græcorum"; and Trajan speaks with contempt of the Greeks.—Pliny, *Ep.* x. 49: "Gymnasiis indulgent Græculi."

[2] Claudius dismissed a Greek magistrate from his employment, because he was ignorant of Latin.—Suetonius, *Claud.* 16.

[3] ——— "Creditur olim
Velificatus Athos, et quicquid Græcia mendax
Audet in historia."—Juv. *Sat.* x. 173.

Herod. vii. 21. Thucyd. iv. 109. Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, iii. 145.

olished than the Greeks, though they were much superior to em in virtue and courage. They acknowledged their inriority, and readily derived lessons of instruction from a eople unable to resist their arms. The obligation was always cognised. And Roman gratitude inflated Greek vanity to ch a degree, that the conquered never perceived that their asters became at last as much their superiors in literary enius as in political and military science. The Greeks seem ways to have remained ignorant that there were Roman riters whose works would, by successive generations and stant nations, be placed almost in the same rank as their wn classic authors. The rhetorical contemporaries of Tacitus nd of Juvenal never suspected that the original genius of ose writers had extended the domain of literature, nor could y critic have persuaded them that Horace had already surassed the popularity of their own poets by a graceful union f social elegance with calm sagacity.

A single example of the supercilious egoism of the Greeks ill be sufficient to show the extent of their presumption uring their political degradation as Roman provincials. When pollonius of Tyana, the pythagorean philosopher, who excited e admiration of the Hellenic world during the first century, isited Smyrna, he was invited to attend the Panionian ssembly. On reading the decree of the council, he observed at it was signed by men who had adopted Roman names, nd he immediately addressed a letter to the Panionians laming their barbarism. He reproached them for laying side the names of their ancestors, for quitting the names of eroes and legislators to assume such names as Lucullus and abricius. Now, when we remember that this rebuke was ravely uttered by a native of the Cappadocian city of Tyana, o a corporation of degenerate Asiatic Greeks, it forms a curius monument of the delusions of national vanity.[1]

The Romans were never very deeply imbued with a passionte admiration for Grecian art, with which every rank in Greece as animated. The national pride and personal vanity of the onquerors, it is true, often coveted the possession of the most elebrated works of art, which were transported to Rome as nuch on account of their celebrity as their merit, for the paintng and sculpture which they could procure as articles of ommercial industry were sufficient to gratify Roman taste. This was peculiarly fortunate for Greece, since there can be no

[1] Philostratus, *Apoll. Vita*, iv. 5; *Apoll. Ep.* 71.

doubt that, if the Romans had been as enthusiastic lovers of art as they were indefatigable hunters after riches, they would not have hesitated to regard all those works of art, which were the public property of the Grecian states, as belonging to the Roman commonwealth by the right of conquest. It was only because the avarice of the people would have received little gratification from the seizure, that Greece was allowed to retain her statues and paintings when she was plundered of her gold and silver.[1] The great dissimilarity of manners between the two nations appears in the aversion with which many distinguished senators viewed the introduction of the works of Grecian art, by Marcellus and Mummius, after the conquests of Syracuse and Corinth. This aversion unquestionably contributed much to save Greece from the general confiscation of her treasures of art, to which the people clung with the most passionate attachment. Cicero says that no Greek city of Europe or Asia would consent to sell a painting, or a statue, or a work of art, but that, on the contrary, all were ready to become purchasers.[2] The inhabitants of Pergamus resisted the attempt of Acratus, a commissioner sent by Nero, to carry off the most celebrated works of art from the cities of Asia.[3] The feeling of art, in the two peoples, is not inaptly illustrated, by comparing the conduct of the Rhodian republic with that of the Emperor Augustus. When the Rhodians were besieged by Demetrius Poliorcetes, they refused to destroy his statues, and those of his father, which had been erected in their agora. But when Augustus conquered Egypt he ordered all the statues of Antony to be destroyed, and with a meanness somewhat at variance with patrician dignity, he accepted a bribe of one thousand talents from the Alexandrines, to spare the statues of Cleopatra. The Greeks honoured art even more than the Romans loved vengeance. Works of art were, at times, carried away by those Roman governors who spared nothing they could pillage in their provinces; but these spoliations were always regarded in the light of direct robberies; and Fulvius Nobilior, Verres, and Piso, who had distinguished themselves in this species of violence, were considered as the most infamous of the Roman magistrates.

It is true that Sylla carried off the ivory statue of Minerva from the temple of Alalcomenæ, and that Augustus removed that of the great temple of Tegea, as a punishment to that city

[1] Paus. *Arcad.* xlvi.
[2] *Verr. in Sic.* 59.
[3] Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 45; xvi. 23.

or espousing the party of Antony.[1] But these very exceptions rove how sparingly the Romans availed themselves of their ights of conquest; or history would have recorded the re- harkable statues which they had allowed to remain in Greece, ather than signalised as exceptions the few which they trans- orted to Rome. When Caligula and Nero were permitted to overn the world according to the impulses of insanity, they rdered many celebrated works of art to be conveyed to Rome —among these, the celebrated Cupid of Praxiteles was twice emoved. It was restored to Thespiæ by Claudius; but, on eing again taken away by Nero, it perished in a conflagration.[2] After the great conflagration at Rome, in which innumerable orks of art perished, Nero transported 500 brazen statues rom Delphi, to adorn the capital and replace the loss it had uffered, and he ordered all cities of Greece and Asia Minor o be systematically plundered.[3] Very little is subsequently ecorded concerning this species of plunder, which Hadrian nd his two immediate successors would hardly have permitted. From the great number of the most celebrated works of ancient rt which Pausanias enumerates in his tour through Greece, it s evident that no extensive injury had then occurred, even to he oldest buildings. After the reign of Commodus, the Roman emperors paid but little attention to art; and unless he value of the materials caused the destruction of ancient works, they were allowed to stand undisturbed until the build- ngs around them crumbled into dust. During the period of nearly a century which elapsed from the time of Pausanias until the first irruption of the Goths into Greece, it is certain hat the temples and public buildings of the inhabited cities were very little changed in their general aspect, from the ppearance which they had presented when the Roman legions irst entered Hellas.[4]

1 Paus. *Bœot.* xxxiii. 4; *Arcad.* xlvi. 1. Augustus carried away the tusks of the Calydonian boar, which were three feet in length, to be placed among the wonders accumulated at Rome. Strabo (viii. 381) mentions that the indifference of Mummius to art induced him to present many works brought from Corinth to the cities near Rome.

2 Paus. *Bœot.* xxvii. 3.

3 Pausanias, *Phocic.* vii. Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 45. Some statues were removed from Olympia.—Paus. *Eliac.* v. 25, 5. Nearer Rome the republic displayed greater rapacity: two thousand statues were carried off from the Etruscan town Volsinii.—Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxiv. 16.

4 See the lists of works of art carried off from Greece, in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, art. "Painting and Statuary."

Section XI

State of Society among the Greeks

In order to give a complete account of the state of society among the Greeks under the Roman empire, it would be necessary to enter into several dissertations connected with the political history of the Romans. To avoid so extensive a field, it will be necessary to give only a cursory sketch of those social peculiarities whose influence, though apparent in the annals of the Roman empire, did not permanently affect the political history of the empire. The state of civilisation, the popular objects of pursuit, even the views of national advancement, continued, under the imperial government, to be very different, and often opposite, in different divisions of the Greek nation.

The inhabitants of Hellas had sunk into a quiet and secluded population. The schools of Athens were still famous, and Greece was visited by numbers of fashionable and learned travellers from other countries, as Italy now is; but the citizens dwelt in their own little world, clinging to antiquated forms and usages, and to old superstitions,—holding little intercourse, and having little community of feeling, either with the rest of the empire or with the other divisions of the Hellenic race.[1]

The maritime cities of Europe, Asia Minor, and the Archipelago, embraced a considerable population, chiefly occupied in commerce and manufactures, and taking little interest in the politics of Rome, or in the literature of Greece. All commerce was despised by the Romans; and though the Greeks had looked on trade with more favour, yet the influence of declining wealth, and of unjust laws, was rapidly tending to depreciate the mercantile character, and to render the occupation less respectable, even in the commercial cities.[2] It is not inappropriate to notice one instance of Roman commercial legislation. Julius Cæsar, among his projects of reform, thought fit to revive an old Roman law, which prohibited any citizen from having in his possession a larger sum than sixty thousand sesterces[3] in the precious metals. This law was, of

[1] Lucian (*Cataplus*, i. 351, edit. Tauch) tells us that the arrival of an Egyptian ship at Piræus was a rare event.

[2] Philostratus (*Apoll. Vit.* iv. 32) mentions the manner in which Apollonius rebuked a Lacedæmonian of good family who engaged in commerce.

[3] £600.

purse, neglected; but under Tiberius it was made a pretext y informers to levy various fines and confiscations in Greece nd Syria.[1] The commerce of this portion of the world, hich had once consisted of commodities of general consumption, declined, under the fiscal avarice of the Romans, into an xport trade of some articles of luxury to the larger cities f the west of Europe. The wines of the Archipelago, ne carpets of Pergamus, the cambric of Cos, and the yed woollens of Laconia, are particularly mentioned.[2] The ecline of trade is not to be overlooked as one of the causes f the decline and depopulation of the Roman empire; for ealth depended even more on commerce, in ancient times, nan it does in modern, from the imperfect means of transort, and the impolitic laws relating to the exportation of grain o Rome, and its gratuitous distribution and sale at a price elow the cost of its production in Italy.

The division of the Greek nation which occupied the most mportant social position in the empire, consisted of the emains of the Macedonian and Greek colonies in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria. These countries were filled with Greeks; nd the cities of Alexandria and Antioch, the second and hird in the empire in size, population, and wealth, were hiefly peopled by Greeks. The influence of Alexandria lone on the Roman empire, and on European civilisation, would require a treatise, in order to do justice to the subject. Its schools of philosophy produced modifications of Christianity in the East, and attempted to infuse a new life nto the torpid members of paganism by means of gnosticism nd neoplatonism. The feuds between the Jews and Christians, which its municipal disputes first created, were bequeathed to ollowing centuries; so that, in western Europe, we still debase Christianity by the admixture of those prejudices which had heir rise in the amphitheatre of Alexandria. Its wealth and opulation excited the jealousy of Augustus, who deprived it of its municipal institutions, and rendered it a prey to the factions of the amphitheatre, the curse of Roman civic anarchy. The populace, unrestrained by any system of order founded on ties of domestic and corporate institutions, and without any social guidance derived from any acknowledged municipal rank, was abandoned to the passions of the wildest democracy, whenever they were crowded together. Hadrian was struck

1 Suetonius, *in Tib.* 49.
2 Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xiv. viii. Juvenal, *Sat.* viii. 101. Horace, *Sat.* i. 2.

with the activity and industry of the Alexandrines; and though he does not appear to have admired their character, he saw that the increase of privileges to some organised classes of the population was the true way to lessen the influence of the mob.

Antioch and the other Greek cities of the East had preserved their municipal privileges; and the Greek population in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria, remained everywhere completely separated from the original inhabitants. Their corporate organisation often afforded them an opportunity of interfering with the details of the public administration, and their intriguing and seditious spirit enabled them to defend their own rights and interests. When the free population of the provinces acquired the rights of Roman citizenship, the Greeks of these countries, who formed the majority of the privileged classes, and were already in possession of the principal share of the local administration, became soon possessed of the whole authority of the Roman government. They appeared as the real representatives of the State, placed the native population in the position of a party excluded from power, and, consequently, rendered it more dissatisfied than formerly. In the East, therefore, after the publication of Caracalla's edict, the Greeks became again the dominant people. In spite of the equality of all the provincials in the eye of the law, a violent opposition was created between the Greeks and the native population in Syria, Egypt, and a large part of Asia Minor, where various nations still retained their own customs and languages. The Greeks, in a large portion of the eastern half of the empire, occupied a position nearly similar to that of the Romans in the western. The same causes produced similar effects, and from the period when the Greeks became a privileged and dominant class, administering the severe fiscal supremacy of the Roman government, instead of ruling with the more tolerant habits of their Macedonian predecessors, their numbers and influence began to decline. Like the Romans of Italy, Gaul, and Spain, the Greeks of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, destroyed themselves.

It is now necessary to enter on a more minute inquiry into the causes which affected the social condition of the native Greeks, since their secluded position in the empire almost conceals them from the view of the political historian. The principal causes of the decline of Greece have been already explained; but the tone of society in the country, and the manner of

wing adopted by the upper and middle ranks, must not be verlooked, in tracing the progress of national decay. During he disorders of the civil wars, while the Roman generals were istributing the accumulated treasures of numerous sovereigns order to gain partisans, not only was the value of the precious etals very much reduced, but enormous fortunes also were ade by many Greeks; and a scale of expense was adopted, y all those who were connected with the administration, which dividuals were rarely prudent enough to diminish before their comes had declined, and the value of money had risen. It as been already remarked, that the increase of wealth consequent on the Macedonian conquests, had tended to augment he size of private properties, and to add to the numbers of aves in Greece. Under the Romans, the general riches of he country were indeed very much diminished; but individuals were enabled to acquire fortunes greater than had een possessed by the ancient monarchs, and to possess states larger than the territories of many celebrated republics. ulius Eurycles owned a province, and Herodes Atticus could ave purchased a kingdom.[1] While a few individuals could mass unbounded wealth, the bulk of the people were prented from acquiring even a moderate independency; and hen Plutarch says that Greece, in his time, could not arm ore than three thousand *hoplitæ*, though the small states of icyon and Megara each furnished that number at the battle f Platea, it is necessary to remember the change which had ken place in the size of private properties, as well as the tered state of society, for both tended to diminish the umbers of the free population.[2] The taxes of Greece were mitted to Rome, and expended beyond the limits of the rovince. The most useful public works were neglected, xcept when a benevolent emperor like Hadrian, or a wealthy dividual like Herodes Atticus, thought fit to direct some ortion of their expenditure to what was useful as well as namental. Under a continuance of such circumstances, reece was drained of money and capital.

The poverty of Greece was farther increased by the gradual se in the value of the precious metals,—an evil which began be generally felt about the time of Nero, and which affected reece with great severity, from the altered distribution of

1 The unjust acquisitions of C. Antonius in Cephallenia have been mentioned at ge 65. Tacitus tells us that Claudius Timarchus of Crete afforded another example the exorbitant accumulation of riches by individuals in Greece.—*Ann.* xv. 20.

2 *De Defectu Oraculorum*, c. viii.

wealth in the country, and the loss of its foreign commerce. Greece had once been rich in mines, which had been a source of wealth and prosperity to Siphnos and Athens, and had laid the foundation of the power of Philip of Macedon. Gold and silver mines, when their produce is regarded as articles of commerce, are a surer basis of wealth than mines of lead and copper. The evils which have arisen in countries where gold and silver have been produced, have proceeded from the fiscal regulations of the government. The fiscal measures of the Romans soon rendered it a ruinous speculation for private individuals to attempt working mines of the precious metals, and, in the hands of the State, they soon proved unprofitable. Many mines were exhausted; and even though the value of the precious metals was enhanced, some, beyond the influence of the Roman power, were abandoned from those causes which, after the second century of the Christian era, produced a sensible diminution in the commercial transactions of the old hemisphere.[1]

Greece suffered in the general decay; her commerce and manufactures, being confined to supplying the consumption of a diminished and impoverished population, sank into insignificancy. It may be observed, that in a declining state of society, where political, financial, and commercial causes combine to diminish the wealth of a nation, it is difficult for individuals to alter their manner of life, and to restrict their expenditure, with the promptitude necessary to escape impoverishment. It is indeed seldom in their power to estimate the progress of the decay; and a reasonable jointure, or a necessary mortgage, may ruin a family.

In this declining state of society, complaints of excessive luxury are generally prevalent, and the Greek writers of the second century are filled with lamentations on this subject. Such complaints, however, when applied to Greece, do not prove that the majority of the higher classes were living in a manner injurious to society, either from their effeminacy or vicious expenditure. They only show that the greater part of the incomes of private persons was consumed by their personal expenditure; and that a due proportion was not set

[1] Jacob's *Historical Inquiry into the Production and Consumption of the Precious Metals*, i. 35, 42. Though the principles of this Inquiry are correct, the author is certainly in error in his estimate of the amount of gold and silver drawn from mines and put in circulation during the middle ages. The gold coinage of the Byzantine empire was so abundant that it circulated over all Europe, from the tenth to the twelfth century, and it must have been supplied by mines then worked.

art for creating new productive property, in order to replace e deterioration, which time is ever causing in that which eady exists. People of property, when their annual incomes oved insufficient for their personal expenditure, began to rrow money, instead of trying to diminish their expenses. accumulation of debts became general throughout the ntry, and formed a great evil in the time of Plutarch.[1] ese debts were partly caused by the oppression of the man government, and by the chicanery of the fiscal officers, ways pressing for ready money, and were generally contracted Roman money-lenders. It was in this way that the Roman ministration produced its most injurious effects in the provin-, by affording to capitalists the means of accumulating enor-ous wealth, and by forcing the proprietors of land into abject verty. The property of Greek debtors was at last trans-red, to a very great extent, to their Roman creditors. This nsference, which, in a homogeneous society, might have vigorated the upper classes, by substituting an industrious nocracy for an idle aristocracy, had a very different effect. introduced new feelings of rivalry and extravagance, by ing the country with foreign landlords. The Greeks could t long maintain the struggle, and they sank gradually lower d lower in wealth, until their poverty introduced an altered te of society, and taught them the prudential and indus-ous habits of farmers, in which tranquil position they escape, t only from the eye of history, but even from antiquarian earch.

It is difficult to convey a correct notion of the evils d demoralisation produced by private debts in the ancient rld, though they often appear as one of the most power-agents in political revolutions, and were a constant subject attention to the statesman, the lawgiver, and the political ilosopher. Modern society has completely annihilated their litical effects. The greater facilities afforded to the trans-ence of landed property, and the ease with which capital w circulates, have given an extension to the operations of nking which has remedied this peculiar defect in society. must be noticed, too, that the ancients regarded landed operty as the accessory of the citizen, even when its amount termined his rank in the commonwealth; but the moderns ew the proprietor as the accessory of the landed property;

[1] Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν δανείζεσθαι—*De Vitando Ære alieno.*

and the political franchise, being inherent in the estate, is lost by the citizen who alienates his property.

In closing this view of the state of the Greek people under the imperial government, it is impossible not to feel that Greece cannot be included in the general assertion of Gibbon, that "if a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus."[1] It may be doubted whether the Roman government ever relaxed the systematic oppression under which the agricultural and commercial population of its provinces groaned; and even Hadrian himself can hardly claim greater merit than that of having humanely administered a system radically bad, and endeavoured to correct its most prominent features of injustice. Greece, indeed, reached its lowest degree of misery and depopulation about the time of Vespasian; but still there is ample testimony in the pages of cotemporary writers, to prove that the desolate state of the country was not materially improved for a long period, and that only partial signs of amelioration were apparent in the period so much vaunted by Gibbon.[2] The liberality of Hadrian, and the munificence of Herodes Atticus, were isolated examples, and could not change the constitution of Rome. Many splendid edifices of antiquity were repaired by these two benefactors of Greece, but many works of public utility remained neglected on account of the poverty of the diminished population of the country; and most of the works of Hadrian and Herodes Atticus contributed little more to the well-being of the people than the wages of the labourer expended on their construction.[3] The roads and aqueducts of Hadrian were wise exceptions,—as they diminished the expenses of transport, and afforded increased facilities for production. Still the sumptuous edifices, of which remains still exist, indicate that the object of building was the erection of magnificent monuments of art—to commemorate the

[1] *Decline and Fall*, i. 216, Smith's edit. The state of Egypt was almost as bad as that of Greece.—Aristides, *Orat. Egypt.* Compare Milman's *History of Christianity*, vol. i. book ii. c. vii.; and Hegewisch, *Essai sur l'Epoque de l'Histoire Romaine la plus heureuse pour le Genre humain*, tr. par Solvet, which support the opinion of Gibbon with many examples.

[2] Plutarch, Lucian, Pausanias, Philostratus.

[3] The Athenians ridiculed the ostentation of Herodes in covering the seats of the Stadium with marble with the money he had gained from them by his sharp bargains. They said it was truly Panathenaic.—Philostr. *Sophist. Vitæ*, ii. iv.

te and splendour of the founder, not to increase the re-
ırces of the land or improve the condition of the industrious
sses.

The condition of a declining population by no means
plies that any portion of the people is actually suffering
m want of the necessaries of life. A sudden change in the
rection of commerce, and a considerable decrease in the
mand for the productions of manufacturing industry, must
leed, at the time when such events occur, deprive numbers
their usual means of subsistence, and create great misery,
fore the population suffers the ultimate diminution which
se causes necessitate. Such events may occur in an im-
oving as well as in a declining society. But, when the bulk
a country's productions is drawn from its own soil, and
nsumed by its own inhabitants, the population may be in a
clining condition, without the circumstance being suspected
some time, either at home or abroad. The chief cause of the
terioration of the national resources will then arise from
e members of society consuming too great a proportion of
eir annual income, without dedicating a due portion of their
venues to reproduction; in short, from expending their
comes, without creating new sources of income, or striving
augment the old. Greece suffered from all the causes
uded to; her commerce and manufactures were transferred
other lands; and, when the change was completed, her
habitants resolved to enjoy life, instead of labouring to re-
ace the wealth which their country had lost. But this
minution in the wealth of the people requires to be noticed,
laying the foundation for a great step in the improvement
the human species. Poverty rendered slavery less frequent,
d destroyed many of the channels by which the slave trade
d flourished. The condition of the slaves also underwent
veral modifications, as the barrier between the slave
d the citizen was broken down. At this favourable con-
ncture Christianity stepped in, to prevent avarice from ever
covering the ground which humanity had gained.

Under oppressive governments, the person sometimes be-
mes more insecure than property. This appears to have
en the case under the Roman, as it has since been under
e Turkish government; and the population, in such cases,
creases much more rapidly than property is destroyed. The
habitants of Greece under the Roman empire found them-
lves possessed of buildings, gardens, vineyards, olive planta-

tions, and all the agricultural produce which the accumulated capital of former ages had created, to an extent capable of maintaining a far more numerous population. The want of commerce, neglected roads, the rarity of the precious metals in circulation, and the difficulties thrown in the way of petty traffic, by injudicious legislation, rendered the surplus produce of each separate district of little value. The inhabitants enjoyed the mere necessaries of life, and some of the luxuries of their climate, in great abundance; but when they sought to purchase the productions of art and foreign commerce, they felt themselves to be poor. Such a state of society inevitably introduces a system of wasting what is superfluous, and of neglecting to prepare new means of future production. In this condition of indifference and ease the population of Greece remained, until the weakness of the Roman government, the disorders of the army, and the diminution and disarming of the free population, opened a way for the northern nations into the heart of the empire.[1]

Section XII

Influence of Religion and Philosophy on Society

The earliest records of the Greeks represent them as living completely free from the despotic authority of a priestly class. The natural consequence of this freedom was an indefinite latitude in the dogmas of the national faith: and the priesthood, as it existed, became a very incorrect interpreter of public opinion in religious questions. The belief in the gods of Olympus had been shaken as early as the age of Pericles, and had undergone many modifications after the Macedonian conquests. From the time the Romans became masters of Greece, the majority of the educated were votaries of the different philosophical sects,—every one of which viewed the established religion as a mere popular delusion. But the Roman government, and the municipal authorities, continued to support the various religions of the different provinces in their legal rights, though the priesthood generally enjoyed this support rather in their character of constituted corporations than because they were regarded as spiritual guides. The

[1] The depreciation in Roman money after the time of Caracalla must have accelerated the impoverishment of the people. See Appendix II., on Roman and Byzantine money.

ount of their revenues, and the extent of their civic rights l privileges, were the chief objects which engaged the atten- n of the magistrate.

The wealth and number of the religious establishments in eece, and the large funds possessed by corporations, which e appropriated to public festivals, contributed in no small gree to encourage idleness among the people, and perpetuate aste for extravagance. The great festivals of the Olympic, hic, and Isthmian games, in so far as they served to unite whole Greek nation in a common place of assembly for ional objects, were, indeed, productive of many advantages. ey contributed to maintain a general standard of public nion throughout the Hellenic race, and they kept up a feel- of nationality. But the dissipation occasioned by the ltitude of local religious feasts, and the extravagant public usements celebrated at the expense of the funds belonging the temples, produced the most injurious effects on society. The privilege called the right of asylum, by which some cient temples became sanctuaries where fugitive slaves were otected against the vengeance of their masters, where debtors uld escape the pursuit of their creditors, and where the rst criminals defied the justice of the law, tended to courage the open violation of every principle of justice. e fear of punishment, the strength of moral obligations, l the respect due to religion, were destroyed by the impunity us openly granted to the most heinous crimes. This abuse d extended to such a degree under the Roman government, t the senate found it necessary, in the reign of Tiberius, to tigate the evil; but superstition was too powerful to allow a mplete reform, and many shrines were allowed to retain the ht of asylum to a much later period.[1]

Though ancient superstitions were still practised, old reli- us feelings were extinct. The oracles, which had once med the most remarkable of the sacred institutions of the eeks, had fallen into decay.[2] It is, however, incorrect to ppose that the Pythoness ceased to deliver her responses m the time of our Saviour's birth, for she was consulted by e emperors long after. Many oracles continued to be in nsiderable repute, even after the introduction of Christianity o Greece. Pausanias mentions the oracle of Mallos, in

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 60. Crebrescebat enim Græcas per urbes licentia atque impuni- asyla statuendi.—Ibid. iv. 14.

[2] Plutarch, *De Orac. Defect.* vii. 709; edit. Tauch.

Cilicia, as the most veracious in his time.[1] Claros and Didymi were famous, and much consulted in the time of Lucian; and even new oracles were commenced as a profitable speculation.[2] The oracles continued to give their responses to fervent votaries, long after they had fallen into general neglect. Julian endeavoured to revive their influence, and he consulted those of Delphi, Delos, and Dodona, concerning the result of his Persian expedition.[3] He vainly attempted to restore Delphi, and Daphne, near Antioch, to their ancient splendour.[4] Even so late as the reign of Theodosius the Great, those of Delphi, Didymi, and Jupiter Ammon, were in existence, but from that period they became utterly silent.[5] The reverence which had formerly been paid to them was transferred to astrologers, who were consulted by all ranks and on all occasions. Tiberius, Otho, Hadrian, and Severus, are all mentioned as votaries of this mode of searching into the secrets of futurity.[6] Yet hidden divination, to which astrology belonged, had been prohibited by the laws of the twelve tables, and was condemned both by express law and by the spirit of the Roman state religion. It was regarded, even by the Greeks, as an illicit and disgraceful practice.[7]

During the first century of the Christian era, the worship of Serapis made great progress in every part of the Roman empire. This worship inculcated the existence of another world, and of a future judgment. The fact deserves notice, as it indicates the annihilation of all reverence for the old system of paganism, and marks a desire in the public mind to search after those truths which the Christian dispensation soon after revealed. A moral rule of life with a religious sanction was a want which society began to feel when Christianity appeared to supply it.

The speculations of the philosophers had first shaken the respect of the Greeks for the religion of their ancestors. The religion of the people was, however, so utterly worthless as a moral guide, that the worst effect of the destruction of its influence was the separation of the ethic and intellectual educa-

[1] *Attica*, xxxiv. 2. [2] Lucian's *Alexander and Peregrinus*.
[3] Theodoretus, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 16.
[4] Cedrenus, *Hist Comp.* p. 304. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 12.
[5] See various authorities cited by Van Limburg Brouwer, *Histoire de la Civilisation morale et religieuse des Grecs*, vol. vi. p. 32. Symmachus, *Epist.* iv. 35.
[6] Tacitus, *Ann.* vii. 20; *Hist.* i. 22. Spartianus, *Hadrian*, 2. Severus, p. 65, edit. Paris, 1620.
[7] Ars mathematica damnabilis est et interdicta omnino.—*Cod. Just.* 9. 8. 2. Bonamy, *Du Rapport de la Magie avec la Theologie Paienne.*—*Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions*, vii. 25.

n of the higher and lower classes, which ensued as soon as e systems of the philosophers and priests were brought into ect opposition. In so far as the civilisation of the Greek e was concerned, it was doubtless more effectually advanced the formation of a national philosophy than it could ever ve been by the authority of a religion so utterly destitute of ellectual power, and so compliant in its form, as that of eece. The attention which the Greeks always paid to philo- phy and metaphysical speculation, is a curious feature in ir mental character, and owes its origin, in part, to the ppy logical analogies of their native language; but, in the ys of Grecian independence, this was only a distinctive aracteristic of a small portion of the cultivated minds in the ion. From that peculiar condition of society which re- ted from the existence of a number of small independent tes, a larger portion of the nation was occupied with the her branches of political business than has ever been the e in any other equally numerous body of mankind. Every y in Greece held the rank of a capital, and possessed its n statesmen and lawyers. The sense of this importance, l the weight of this responsibility, stimulated the Greeks to extraordinary exertions of intellect with which their history illed; for the strongest spur to exertion among men is the stence of a duty imposed as a voluntary obligation.

The habits of social intercourse, and the simple manner of , which prevailed in the Greek republics, rendered the vate conduct of every distinguished citizen as well known, l as constantly a subject of scrutiny to his fellow-citizens, is public career. This powerful agency of public opinion ved to enforce a conventional morality which, though lax in ethics, was at least imperative in its demands. But when international system of the Hellenic states was destroyed, n an altered condition of society had introduced greater acy into the habits of social life, and put a stop to public rcourse among the citizens of the same region, by giving arked prominence to the distinctions of rank and wealth, private conduct of those who were engaged in public life , in a great degree, withdrawn from the examination of the ple; and the effect of public opinion was gradually kened as the grounds on which it was formed became less sonal and characteristic.

olitical circumstances began, about the same time, to ken the efficacy of public opinion in affairs of government

and administration. The want of some substitute, to replace its powerful influence on the everyday conduct of man, was so imperiously felt that one was eagerly sought for. Religion had long ceased to be a guide in morality; and men strove to find some feeling which would replace the forgotten fear of the gods, and that public opinion which could once inspire self-respect.[1] It was hoped that philosophy could supply the want; and it was cultivated not only by the studious and the learned, but by the world at large, in the belief that the self-respect of the philosopher would prove a sure guide to pure morality, and inspire a deep sense of justice. The necessity of obtaining some permanent power over the moral conduct of mankind was naturally suggested to the Greeks by the political injustice under which they suffered; and the hope that philosophical studies would temper the minds of their masters to equity, and awaken feelings of humanity in their hearts, could not fail to exert considerable influence. When the Romans themselves had fallen into a state of moral and political degradation, lower even than that of the Greeks, it is not surprising that the educated classes should have cultivated philosophy with great eagerness, and with nearly similar views. The universal craving after justice and truth affords a key to the profound respect with which teachers of philosophy were regarded. Their authority and their character were so high that they mixed with all ranks, and preserved their power, in spite of all the ridicule of the satirists. The general purity of their lives, and the justice of their conduct, were acknowledged, though a few may have been corrupted by court favour; and pretenders may often have assumed a long beard and dirty garments, to act the ascetic or the jester with greater effect in the houses of the wealthy Romans. The inadequacy of any philosophical opinions to produce the results required of them was, at last, apparent in the changes and modifications which the various sects were constantly making in the tenets of their founders, and the vain attempts that were undertaken to graft the paganism of the past on the modern systems of philosophy. The great principle of truth, which all were eagerly searching after, seemed to elude their grasp; yet these investigations were not without great use in improving the intellectual and moral condition of the higher orders, and rendering life toler-

[1] Tacitus owns the confusion in his own feelings.—*Ann.* vi. 22. "Sed mihi, haec ac talia audienti, in incerto judicium est, fatone res mortalium et necessitate immutabili an forte volvantur.

able, when the tyranny and anarchy of the imperial government threatened the destruction of society. They prepared the minds of men for listening candidly to a purer religion, and rendered many of the votaries of philosophy ready converts to the doctrines of Christianity.

Philosophy lent a splendour to the Greek name; yet, with the exception of Athens, learning and philosophy were but little cultivated in European Greece. The poverty of the inhabitants, and the secluded position of the country, permitted few to dedicate their time to literary pursuits; and after the time of the Antonines, the wealthy cities of Asia, Syria, and Egypt, contained the real representatives of the intellectual supremacy of the Hellenic race. The Greeks of Europe, unnoticed by history, were carefully cherishing their national institutions; while, in the eyes of foreigners, the Greek character and fame depended on the civilisation of an expatriated population, already declining in number, and hastening to extinction. The social institutions of the Greeks have, therefore, been even more useful to them in a national point of view than their literature.

Section XIII

THE SOCIAL CONDITION OF THE GREEKS AFFECTED BY THE WANT OF COLONIES OF EMIGRATION

The want of foreign colonies, which admitted of a constant influx of new emigrants, must have exercised a powerful influence in arresting the progress of society in the Roman world. Rome never, like Phœnicia and Greece, permitted numerous bands of her citizens to depart from poverty in their own country, in order to better their fortunes and enjoy the benefits of self-government as independent communities in other lands. Her oligarchical constitution regarded the people as the property of the State. The civilisation of the Romans followed only in the train of their armies, and stopped when the emperors ceased to pursue the system of conquest which had previously engaged the energies and increased the population of the State. For several ages war operated as a stimulant to population at Rome, as colonisation has served in modern times. It increased the general wealth by an influx of slave labour; it excited the active energies of the people, and it opened a career of advancement. But the gains derived

from an evil source cannot be productive of permanent good. Even before the policy of Augustus had established universal peace, and reduced the Roman army into a corps of gendarmerie or armed police for guarding the internal tranquillity of the provinces, or watching the frontiers, a combination of inherent defects in the constitution of the Roman state had begun to destroy the lower order of Roman citizens.[1] The people required a new field of action when the old career of conquest was closed for ever, in order to engage their energies in active pursuits, and prevent them from pining away in poverty and idleness. The want of colonies of emigration, at this conjuncture, kept all the evil elements of the population fermenting within the State. The want of some distant spot connected with the past history of their race, but freed from the existing social restrictions which weighed heavily on the industrious, the ambitious, and the proud, was required by the Romans to relieve society and render political reforms possible. Various attempts were made to counteract the poverty and the want of occupation among the free labourers which was produced at Rome by every long cessation of war. C. Gracchus introduced the annual distributions of grain, which became one of the principal causes of the ruin of the republic; and Augustus established his colonies of legionaries over Italy in a manner that accelerated its depopulation.

Foreign emigration was but ill replaced by military colonies, by colonial municipalities, and by the practice adopted by the Roman citizens of seeking their fortunes in Spain, Gaul, and Britain; though that species of emigration long tended to preserve an impulse towards improvement in the western portion of the Roman empire. The policy of the emperors was directed to render society stationary; and it escaped the observation of profound statesmen, like Augustus and Tiberius, that the most efficient means of securing it from decline consisted in the formation of a regular demand on the population, by permitting emigration. Foreign colonisation was, however, adverse to all the prejudices of a Roman. The policy and religion of the State were equally opposed to the residence of any citizen beyond the bounds of the empire; and the constant diminution of the inhabitants of Italy, which had accompanied the extended conquests of the republic, indicated that the first

[1] See the able examination of this subject in the *Economie Politique des Romaines*, par Dureau de la Malle; and the excellent *Memoire sur les Secours publics chez les Romains*, par Naudet.—*Academie des Inscriptions*, Nouv. Coll. tom. xiii.

duty of the masters of Italy was to encourage an increase of the population, which they were not aware could be promoted by emigration.

The decline in the population of Italy proceeded from evils inherent in the political system of the Roman government. They exercised their influence in the Grecian provinces of the empire, but they can only be traced with historical accuracy, in their details, close to the centre of the executive power. The system of administration in the republic had always tended to aggrandise the aristocracy, who talked much of glory, but thought constantly of wealth. When the conquests of Rome were extended over all the richest countries of the ancient world, the leading families accumulated incredible riches,—riches, indeed, far exceeding the wealth of modern sovereigns. Villas and parks were formed over all Italy on a scale of the most sumptuous grandeur, and land became more valuable as hunting grounds than as productive farms. The same habits were introduced into the provinces.[1] In the neighbourhood of Rome, agriculture was ruined by the public distributions of grain which was received as tribute from the provinces, and by the bounty granted to importing merchants in order to secure a maximum price of bread.[2] The public distributions at Alexandria and Antioch must have proved equally injurious. Another cause of the decline in the population of the empire was the great increase of the slaves which took place on the rapid conquests of the Romans, and the diffusion of the immense treasures suddenly acquired by their victories. There is always a considerable waste of productive industry among a slave population; and free labourers cease to exist, rather than perpetuate their race, if their labour be degraded to the same level in society as that of slaves. When the insecurity of property and person under the Roman government after the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and the corrupt state of society, are added to these various causes of decay, the decline and depopulation of the empire does not require farther explanation.

Yet society would not, probably, have declined as it did, under the weight of the Roman power, had the active, intelligent, and virtuous members of the middle classes possessed the means of escaping from a social position so calculated to

[1] Latifundia perdidere Italiam, jam vero et provincias.—Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xvii. 7, 3. Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 54. We now see something similar in the deer-forests recently formed in Scotland.

[2] Suetonius, *Aug.* 42.

excite feelings of despair. It is in vain to offer conjectures on the subject; for the vice in the Roman constitution which rendered all their military and state colonies merely sources of aggrandisement to the aristocracy, may have proceeded from some inherent defect in the social organisation of the people, and, consequently, might have entailed ruin on any Roman society established beyond the authority of the senate or the emperors. The social organisation of nations affects their vitality as much as their political constitution affects their power and fortunes.

The exclusively Roman feeling, which was adverse to all foreign colonisation, was first attacked when Christianity spread itself beyond the limits of the empire. The fact that Christianity was not identical with citizenship, or, at least, with subjection to Rome, was a powerful cause of creating that adverse feeling towards the Christians which branded them as enemies of the human race; for, in the mouth of a Roman, the human race was a phrase for the empire of Rome, and the Christians were really persecuted by emperors like Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, because they were regarded as having no attachment to the Roman government, because their humanity was stronger than their citizenship.

Section XIV

Effects produced in Greece by the inroads of the Goths

After the reign of Alexander Severus, the whole attention of the Roman government was absorbed by the necessity of defending the empire against the invasions of the northern nations. Two centuries of communication with the Roman world had extended the effects of incipient civilisation throughout all the north of Europe. Trade had created new wants, and given a new impulse to society. This state of improvement always causes a rapid increase of population, and awakens a spirit of enterprise, which makes the apparent increase even greater than the real. The history of every people which has attained any eminence in the annals of mankind, has been marked by a similar period of activity. The Greeks, the Romans, and the Arabs, poured out a succession of armies, which must have astonished the nations which they attacked, quite as much as the apparently inexhaustible armies

of the Goths amazed the degenerate Romans. Yet few events, in the whole course of history, seem more extraordinary than the success of the uncivilised Goths against the well-disciplined legions of imperial Rome, and their successful inroads into the thickly-peopled provinces of the Roman empire. The causes of the success of the Goths are evidently to be sought within the empire: the defenceless state of the population, which was everywhere carefully disarmed, the oppression of the provincials, the disorder in the finances, and the relaxation in the discipline of the troops, contributed more to their victories than their own strength or military skill. If any national feeling, or common political interest, had connected the people, the army, and the sovereign, the Roman empire would have easily repulsed the attacks of all its enemies; nay, had the government not placed itself in direct opposition to the interests of its subjects, and arrested their natural progress by vicious legislation and corrupt administration, the barbarous inhabitants of Germany, Poland, and Russia, could have offered no more effective resistance to the advance of Roman colonisation than those of Spain, Gaul, and Britain. But the task of extending the domain of civilisation required to be supported by the energy of national feelings; it was far beyond the strength of the imperial or any other central government. The ablest of the despots who styled themselves the world's masters, did not dare, though nourished in camps, to attempt a career of foreign conquest; these imperial soldiers were satisfied with the inglorious task of preserving the limits of the empire without diminution. Even Severus, after he had consolidated a systematic despotism, based on military power, did not succeed in extending the empire. This avowed inability of the Roman armies to make any further progress, invited the barbarians to attack the provinces. If a body of assailants proved successful in breaking through the Roman lines, they were sure of considerable plunder. If they were repulsed, they could generally evade pursuit. These incursions were at first the enterprises of armed bands and small tribes, but they became afterwards the employment of armies and nations. To the timid eye of the unwarlike and unarmed citizens of the empire, the whole population of the north appeared to be constantly on its march, to plunder and enslave the wealthy and peaceable inhabitants of the south.

Various means of defence were employed by the reigning

sovereigns. Alexander Severus secured the tranquillity of the frontiers by paying subsidies to the barbarians; Decius fell, defending the provinces against an immense army of Goths which had penetrated into the heart of Mœsia; and Gallus purchased the retreat of the victors by engaging to pay them an annual tribute. The disorder in the Roman government increased, the succession of emperors became more rapid, and the numbers of the invaders augmented. Various tribes and nations, called, by the Greeks and Romans, Scythians and Goths, and belonging to the great families now called the Sclavonic and Germanic stock, under the names of East and West Goths, Vandals, Heruls, Borans, Karps, Peuks, and Urugunds, crossed the Danube.[1] Their incursions were pushed through Mœsia into Thrace and Macedonia; an immense booty was carried away, and a still greater amount of property was destroyed; thousands of the industrious inhabitants were reduced to slavery, and a far greater number massacred by the cruelty of the invaders.

The Greeks were awakened, by these invasions, from the state of lethargy in which they had reposed for three centuries. They began to repair the long-neglected fortifications of their towns, and muster their city guards and rural police, for a conflict in defence of their property. Cowardice had long been supposed, by the Romans, to be an incurable vice of the Greeks, who had been compelled to appear before the Romans with an obsequious and humble mien, and every worthless Roman had thence arrogated to himself a fancied superiority. But the truth is, that all the middle classes in the Roman world had, from the time of Augustus, become averse to sacrificing their ease for the doubtful glory to be gained in the imperial service. No patriotic feeling drew men to the camp: and the allurements of ambition were stifled by obscurity of station and hopelessness of promotion. The young nobility of Rome, when called upon to serve in the legions, after the defeat of Varus, displayed signs of cowardice unparalleled in the history of Greece. Like the Fellahs of modern Egypt, they cut off their thumbs in order to escape military service.[2] Greece could contribute but little to the defence of the empire; but Caracalla had drawn from Sparta some recruits whom he had formed into a Lacedæmonian phalanx.[3] Decius, before his defeat, intrusted the defence of Thermopylæ to Claudius, who was afterwards emperor, but who had only

[1] Zosimus, i. 31, 42. [2] Suetonius, *in Aug.* 24. [3] Herodian, iv. 8.

fifteen hundred regular troops, in addition to the ordinary Greek militia of the cities.[1] The smallness of the number is curious; it indicates the tranquil condition of the Hellenic population before the northern nations penetrated into the heart of the empire.

The preparations for defending the country were actively carried on, both in northern Greece and at the isthmus. In the reign of Valerian the walls of Athens, which had not been put in a proper state of defence from the time of Sylla, were repaired, and the fortifications across the isthmus of Corinth were restored and garrisoned by Peloponnesian troops.[2] It was not long before the Greeks were called upon to prove the efficiency of their warlike arrangements.[3] A body of Goths, having established themselves along the northern shores of the Black Sea, commenced a series of naval expeditions. They soon penetrated through the Thracian Bosphorus, and, aided by additional bands who had proceeded from the banks of the Danube by land, they marched into Asia Minor, and plundered Chalcedon, Nicomedia, Nicea, and Prusa, A.D. 259. This successful enterprise was soon followed by still more daring expeditions.[4]

In the year 267, another fleet, consisting of five hundred vessels, manned chiefly by the Goths and Heruls, passed the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. They seized Byzantium and Chrysopolis, and advanced, plundering the islands and coasts of the Ægean Sea, and laying waste many of the principal cities of the Peloponnesus. Cyzicus, Lemnos, Skyros, Corinth, Sparta, and Argos, are named as having suffered by their ravages.[5] From the time of Sylla's conquest of Athens, a period of nearly three hundred and fifty years had elapsed, during which Attica had escaped the evils of war; yet when

1 These troops consisted of 200 Dardanians, 100 heavy-armed soldiers, 160 cavalry, 60 Cretan bowmen, and 1000 newly enrolled troops of the line.—Trebellius Pollio, *Claud.* 16. Gibbon, chap. x. note 35.

2 Zosimus, i. c. 29. Zonaras, i. 629. Some antiquaries have traced an imaginary wall round Athens, and these two passages are brought forward to prove that Valerian constructed this new wall. The foundation would be insufficient for a historian. I agree with Colonel Leake, in thinking that the repairs of Valerian followed the line of the ancient walls, and I regret to see the wall of the antiquaries, against which the ground protests, traced as authentic in the plan of Athens annexed to the excellent article in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*. Twenty years' personal observation on my part has only confirmed the unrivalled topographical sagacity of Colonel Leake. It is, however, a mere matter of opinion, but foundations, broken tiles, and marble fragments, appear to me better evidence than strained interpretations and applications of the passages in Thucydides and Zosimus. The fountain of Callirhoe, the stadium, and Ardettus, were without the walls before the time of Themistocles; why not after? Traces of the ancient wall of the time of Pericles must be found, not imagined.

3 Syncellus, *Chron.* 381. 4 Zosimus, i. 34. 5 Syncellus, 382.

the Athenians were called upon to defend their homes against the Goths, they displayed a spirit worthy of their ancient fame. An officer, named Cleodamus, had been sent by the government from Byzantium to Athens, in order to repair the fortifications, but a division of these Goths landed at the Piræus, and succeeded in carrying Athens by storm, before any means were taken for its defence. Dexippus, an Athenian of rank in the Roman service, soon contrived to reassemble the garrison of the Acropolis; and by joining to it such of the citizens as possessed some knowledge of military discipline, or some spirit for warlike enterprise, he formed a little army of two thousand men. Choosing a strong position in the Olive Grove, he circumscribed the movements of the Goths, and so harassed them by a close blockade that they were soon compelled to abandon Athens. Cleodamus, who was not at Athens when it was surprised, had in the meantime assembled a fleet and gained a naval victory over a division of the barbarian fleet.[1] These reverses were a prelude to the ruin of the Goths. A Roman fleet entered the Archipelago, and a Roman army, under the emperor Gallienus, marched into Illyricum; the separate divisions of the Gothic expedition were everywhere overtaken by these forces, and destroyed in detail. During this invasion of the empire, one of the divisions of the Gothic army crossed the Hellespont into Asia, and succeeded in plundering the cities of the Troad, and in destroying the celebrated temple of Diana of Ephesus.

Dexippus was himself the historian of the Gothic invasion of Attica, but, unfortunately, little information on the subject can be collected from the fragments of his works which now exist.[2] There is a celebrated anecdote connected with this incursion which throws some light on the state of the Athenian population, and on the conduct of the Gothic invaders of the empire. The fact of its currency is a proof of the easy circumstances in which the Athenians lived, of the literary idleness in which they indulged, and the general mildness of the assailants, whose sole object was plunder. It is said that the Goths, when they had captured Athens, were

[1] Zonaras, xii. 26, vol. i. p. 635. Zinkeisen (*Geschichte Griechenlands*) judiciously corrects the chronology of Zonaras (p. 591, note.) A modern Greek authority, in which I have no confidence, says that these Scythians destroyed the temples, burned the olive trees, and threw down six columns of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which it is not probable was then in such a state of dilapidation as to render the exploit an easy one. Fallmerayer, *Die Entstehung der heutigen Griechen*, 22.

[2] *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ*. Dexippus, Eunapius, &c. Bonn, 1829.

preparing to burn the splendid libraries which adorn the city; but that a Gothic soldier dissuaded them, by telling his countrymen that it was better that the Athenians should continue to waste their time in their halls and porticos over their books, than that they should begin to occupy themselves with warlike exercises. Gibbon, indeed, thinks the anecdote may be suspected as the fanciful conceit of a recent sophist; and he adds, that the sagacious counsellor reasoned like an ignorant barbarian.[1] But the national degradation of the Greeks has co-existed with their pre-eminence in learning during many centuries, so that it appears that this ignorant barbarian reasoned like an able politician. Even the Greeks, who repeated the anecdote, seem to have thought that there was more sound sense in the arguments of the Goth than the great historian is willing to admit. Something more than mere reading and study is required to form the judgment. The cultivation of learning does not always bring with it the development of good sense. It does not always render men wiser, and it generally proves injurious to their bodily activity. When literary pursuits, therefore, become the exclusive object of national ambition, and distinction in the cultivation of literature and abstract science is more esteemed than sagacity and prudence in the everyday duties of life, effeminacy is undoubtedly more likely to prevail than when literature is used as an instrument for advancing practical acquirements, and embellishing active occupations. The rude Goths themselves would probably have admired the poetry of Homer and of Pindar, though they despised the metaphysical learning of the schools of Athens.[2]

The celebrity of Athens, and the presence of the historian Dexippus, have given to this incursion of the barbarians a prominent place in history; but many expeditions are casually mentioned, which must have inflicted greater losses on the Greeks, and spread devastation more widely over the country. These inroads must have produced important changes in the condition of the Greek population, and given a new impulse

1 *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, i. 402; Smith's edit. Zonaras, i. 635.

"To doze and dream by governments oppress'd,
The spirit of a book-worm in each breast."
Campbell, *Lines on Poland.*

2 Ataulph, the Gothic king who married Placidia the sister of Honorius, reasoned like the Goth at Athens. He thought it better to possess the Roman empire, and govern it by Roman officials, than to found a Gothic kingdom, and be obliged to induce a part of the Goths to lay aside their arms, and study as civilians.—Thierry, *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France.*

to society. The passions of men were called into action, and the protection of their property often depended on their own exertions. Public spirit was again awakened, and many cities of Greece successfully defended their walls against the immense armies of barbarians who broke into the empire in the reign of Claudius. Thessalonica and Cassandra were attacked by land and sea. Thessaly and Greece were invaded; but the walls of the towns were generally found in a state of repair, and the inhabitants ready to defend them. The great victory obtained by the emperor Claudius II., at Naissus, broke the power of the Goths; and a Roman fleet in the Archipelago destroyed the remains of their naval forces. The extermination of these invaders of Greece was completed by a great plague which ravaged the East for fifteen years.

During the repeated invasions of the barbarians, an immense number of slaves were either destroyed by war, or carried away by the Goths beyond the Danube. Great facilities were likewise afforded to dissatisfied slaves to escape and join the invaders. The numbers of the slave population in Greece must, therefore, have undergone a reduction, which could not prove otherwise than beneficial to those who remained, and which must also have produced a very considerable change on the condition of the poorer freemen, the value of whose labour must have been considerably increased. The danger in which men of wealth lived, necessitated an alteration in their mode of life; every one was compelled to think of defending his person, as well as his property; new activity was infused into society; the losses caused by the ravages of the Goths, and the mortality produced by the plague, appear to have caused a general improvement in the circumstances of the inhabitants of Greece.

It must here be observed, that the first great inroads of the northern nations, who succeeded in penetrating into the heart of the Roman empire, were directed against the eastern provinces, and that Greece suffered severely by the earliest invasions; yet the eastern portion of the empire alone succeeded in driving back the barbarians, and preserving its population free from any admixture of the Gothic race. This successful resistance was chiefly owing to the national feelings and political organisation of the Greek people. The institutions which the Greeks retained prevented them from remaining utterly helpless in the moment of danger; the magistrates possessed a legitimate authority to take measures for any

extraordinary crisis, and citizens of wealth and talent could render their services useful, without any violent departure from the usual forms of the local administration.[1] The evil of anarchy was not, in Greece, added to the misfortune of invasion. Fortunately for the Greeks, the insignificancy of their military forces prevented the national feelings, which these measures aroused, from giving umbrage either to the Roman emperors or to their military officers in the provinces.

From the various accounts of the Gothic wars of this period which exist, it is evident that the expeditions of the barbarians were, as yet, only undertaken for the purpose of plundering the provinces. The invaders entertained no idea of being able to establish themselves permanently within the bounds of the empire. The celerity of their movements generally made their numbers appear greater than they really were; while the inferiority of their arms and discipline rendered them an unequal match for a much smaller body of the heavy-armed Romans. When the invaders met with a steady and well-combined resistance, they were defeated without much difficulty; but whenever a moment of neglect presented itself, their attacks were repeated with undiminished courage. The victorious reigns of Claudius II., Aurelian, and Probus, prove the immense superiority of the Roman armies when properly commanded; but the custom, which was constantly gaining ground, of recruiting the legions from among the barbarians, reveals the deplorable state of depopulation and weakness to which three centuries of despotism and bad administration had reduced the empire.[2] On the one hand, the government feared the spirit of its subjects, if intrusted with arms, far more than it dreaded the ravages of the barbarians; and on the other, it was unwilling to reduce the number of the citizens paying taxes, by draughting too large a proportion of the industrious classes into the army. The imperial fiscal system rendered it necessary to keep all the provincial landed proprietors carefully disarmed, lest they should revolt, and perhaps make an attempt to revive republican institutions;[3] and the defence of the empire seemed, to the Roman emperors, to demand the maintenance of a

[1] *Cod. Justinianeus*, xi. 29, 3, 4, and 41, 1.
[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, xix. 2; xxxi. 4, 10. Spanheim, *Orbis Romanus*, p. 508.
[3] Gibbon mentions the alarm of Gallienus when the senate repulsed an invasion of the barbarians.—i. 394, Smith's edition.

larger army than the population of their own dominions, from which recruits were drawn, could supply.[1]

Section XV

Changes which preceded the establishment of Constantinople as the capital of the Roman Empire

The Romans had long been sensible that their social vices threatened their empire with ruin, though they never contemplated the possibility of their cowardice delivering it up a prey to barbarous conquerors. Augustus made a vain attempt to stem the torrent of corruption, by punishing immorality in the higher orders. But a privileged class is generally sufficiently powerful to be able to form its own social code of morality, and protect its own vices as long as it can maintain its existence. The immorality of the Romans at last undermined the political fabric of the empire. Two centuries and a half after the failure of Augustus, the emperor Decius endeavoured with as little effect to reform society.[2] Neither of these sovereigns understood how to cure the malady which was destroying the State. They attempted to improve society by punishing individual nobles for general vices. They ought to have annihilated the privileges which raised senators and nobles above the influence of law and public opinion, and subjected them to nothing but the despotic power of the emperor. St. Paul, however, informs us that the whole frame of society was so utterly corrupted that even this measure would have proved ineffectual.[3] The people were as vicious as the senate; all ranks were suffering from a moral gangrene, which no human art could heal. The dangerous abyss to which society was hastening did not escape observation. The alarm gradually spread through every class in the wide extent of the Roman world. A secret terror was felt by the emperors, the senators, and even by the armies. Men's minds were changed, and a divine influence produced a reform of which man's wisdom and strength had proved incapable.

[1] A similar state of society existed in Britain when it was overrun by the Saxons, and in Gaul when it was plundered by the Normans. "Vulgus promiscuum inter Sequanas et Ligerim adversos Danos fortiter resistit; sed quia in caute suscepta est congregatio, a potentioribus nostris facile interficitur."—*Annales Bertin. ad ann.* 850; quoted by Depping, *Histoire des Expéditions Maritimes des Normands*, p. 213.

[2] Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 24; *Hist. Aug.* Trebellius Pollio, *Valer.* 2.

[3] Romans i. 24, 32.

From the death of Alexander Severus to the accession of Diocletian, a great social alteration is visible in paganism; the aspect of the human mind seemed to have undergone a complete metamorphosis. The spirit of Christianity was floating in the atmosphere, and to its influence we must attribute that moral change in the pagan world, during the latter half of the third century, which tended to prolong the existence of the western Roman empire.

Foreign invasions, the disorderly state of the army, the weight of the taxes, and the irregular constitution of the imperial government, produced at this time a general feeling that the army and the State required a new organisation, in order to adapt both to the exigencies of altered circumstances, and save the empire from impending ruin. Aurelian, Probus, Diocletian, and Constantine, appeared as reformers of the Roman empire. The history of their reforms belongs to the records of the Roman constitution, as they were conceived with very little reference to the institutions of the provinces; and only some portion of the modifications then made in the form of the imperial administration will fall within the scope of this work. But though the administrative reforms produced little change in the condition of the Greek population, the Greeks themselves actively contributed to effect a mighty revolution in the whole frame of social life, by the organisation which they gave to the church from the moment they began to embrace the Christian religion. It must not be overlooked, that the Greeks had organised a Christian church before Christianity became the established religion of the empire.

Diocletian found that the Roman empire had lost much of its internal cohesion, and that it could no longer be conveniently governed from one administrative centre. He attempted to remedy the increasing weakness of the coercive principle, by creating four centres of executive authority, controlled by a single imperial legislative emperor. But no human skill could long preserve harmony between four executive despots. Constantine restored the unity of the Roman empire. His reign marks the period in which old Roman political feelings lost their power, and the superstitious veneration for Rome herself ceased. The liberty afforded for new political ideas by the new social organisation was not overlooked by the Greeks. The transference of the seat of government to Byzantium weakened the Roman spirit in the

public administration. The Romans, indeed, from the establishment of the imperial government, had ceased to form a homogeneous people, or to be connected by feelings of attachment and interest, to one common country; and as soon as the rights of Roman citizenship had been conferred on the provincials, Rome became a mere ideal country to the majority of Romans. The Roman citizens, however, in many provinces, formed a civilised caste of society, dwelling among a number of ruder natives and slaves; they were not melted into the mass of the population. In the Grecian provinces, no such distinction prevailed. The Greeks, who had taken on themselves the name and the position of Roman citizens, retained their own language, manners, and institutions; and as soon as Constantinople was founded and became the capital of the empire, a struggle arose whether it was to become a Greek or a Latin city.

Constantine himself does not appear to have perceived this tendency of the Greek population to acquire a predominant influence in the East by supplanting the language and manners of Rome, and he modelled his new capital entirely after Roman ideas and prejudices. Constantinople was, at its foundation, a Roman city, and Latin was the language of the higher ranks of its inhabitants. This fact must not be lost sight of; for it affords an explanation of the opposition which is for ages apparent in the feelings, as well as the interests, of the capital and of the Greek nation. Constantinople was a creation of imperial favour; a regard to its own advantage rendered it subservient to despotism, and, for a long period, impervious to any national feeling. The inhabitants enjoyed exemptions from taxation, and received distributions of grain and provisions, so that the misery of the empire, and the desolation of the provinces, hardly affected them. Left at leisure to enjoy the games of the circus, they were bribed by government to pay little attention to the affairs of the empire. Such was the position of the people of Constantinople at the time of its foundation, and such it continued for many centuries.

CHAPTER II

FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTANTINOPLE AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, TO THE ACCESSION OF JUSTINIAN. A.D. 330–527.

Constantine, in reforming the government, placed the administration in direct hostility to the people—The condition of the Greeks was not improved by Constantine's reforms—Changes produced in the social condition of the Greeks by the alliance of Christianity with their national usages—The Orthodox Church became identified with the Greek nation—Condition of the Greek population of the empire, from the reign of Constantine, to that of Theodosius the Great—Communication of the Greeks with countries beyond the bounds of the Roman empire—Effect of the complete separation of the Eastern from the Western Empire on the Greek nation—Attempts of the Goths to establish themselves in Greece—The national feelings of the Greeks arrested the conquests of the northern barbarians—Declining condition of the Greek population in the European provinces of the Eastern Empire—Improvement in the Eastern Empire from the death of Arcadius to the accession of Justinian—State of civilisation, and influence of national feelings.

Section I

CONSTANTINE, IN REFORMING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, PLACED THE ADMINISTRATION IN DIRECT HOSTILITY TO THE PEOPLE

The warlike frenzy of the Romans rendered the emperors, from commanders of the army, masters of the State. But the soldiers, as soon as they fully comprehended the extent of their power in conferring the imperial dignity, strove to make the emperors their agents in the management of the empire, of which they considered themselves the real proprietors. The army was consequently the branch of the government to which all the others were considered subordinate. The disorders committed, and the defeats experienced, by the troops, at last weakened their influence, and forced the emperors to make various endeavours to reduce the army into a mere instrument of the imperial authority, and to destroy its power in the disposal of the imperial dignity. Two great measures of reform had been contemplated by several of the predecessors of Constantine. Severus had sought to put an

end to the civil authority of the senate in the administration of the empire, and to efface the remains of the ancient political constitution. Diocletian had endeavoured to deprive the army of the power of choosing and of dethroning the sovereign; but until the reign of Constantine, the empire was entirely a military State, and the chief characteristic of the imperial dignity was the military command. Constantine first moulded the measures of reform of preceding emperors into a new system of government. He completed the political edifice on the foundations which Diocletian had laid, by remodelling the army, reconstituting the executive power, creating a new capital, and adopting a new religion. Unfortunately for the bulk of mankind, Constantine, when he commenced his plan of reform, was, from his situation, unconnected with the popular or national sympathies of any class of his subjects, and he considered this state of isolation to be the surest basis of the imperial power, and the best guarantee for the impartial administration of justice.[1]

The emperors had long ceased to regard themselves as belonging to any particular country, and the imperial government was no longer influenced by any attachment to the feelings or institutions of ancient Rome. The glories of the republic were forgotten in the constant and laborious duty of administering and defending the empire. New maxims of policy had been formed, and, in cases where the earlier emperors would have remembered their feelings as citizens of Rome, as well as their policy as sovereigns, the wisest counsellors of Constantine would have calmly appealed to the dictates of general expediency. In the eyes of the emperors, that which their subjects considered as national was only provincial; the history, language, and religion of Greece, Rome, Egypt, and Syria, were merely distinctive characteristics of these different portions of the empire. The emperor, the government, and the army, stood apart, completely separated from the hopes, fears, and interests of the body of the people. Constantine centralised every branch of the executive power in the person of the emperor, and, at the same time, framed a bureaucracy in the administration of each department of public business, in order to guard against the effects of the incapacity or folly of any future sovereign. No more perfect machine of government appears ever to have been established: and,

[1] Gibbon, in his seventeenth chapter, has an admirable review of Constantine's policy.

had it combined any principle capable of enforcing responsibility on the public servants, it might have proved perpetual. It is true that, according to the moral laws of the universe, a government ought to be so constituted as to conform to the principles of truth and justice; but, practically, it is sufficient for the internal security of a State that the government do not act in such a manner as to make the people believe that it is perversely unjust. No foreign enemy ever assailed the Roman empire that could not have been repulsed with ease, had the government and the people formed a united body acting always for the general interest. Constantine, unfortunately, organised the government of the Roman empire as if it were the household of the emperor, and constituted the imperial officials into a caste separate from the people; thus placing it, from the very nature of man, in opposition to the mass of his subjects. In his desire to save the world from anarchy, he created that struggle between the administration and the governed which has ever since existed, either actively or passively, in every country which has inherited the monarchical principle and the laws of imperial Rome. The problem of combining efficient administration with constant responsibility seems, in these states, still unsolved.

A series of changes in the Roman government had been commenced before the time of Constantine; yet the extent and durability of his reforms, and the distinctness of purpose with which they were conceived, must entitle him to rank as one of the greatest legislators of mankind. His defects during his declining years, when his mind and body no longer possessed the activity necessary to inspect and control every detail of a despotic administration which centred in the sovereign's person, ought not to alter our judgment of his numerous wise laws and judicious reforms. Few legislators have effected greater revolutions than Constantine. He transferred the despotic power of the emperor as commander-in-chief of the army, to the emperor as political head of the government; thus rendering the military power subservient to the civil, in the whole range of the administration. He consolidated the dispensation of justice over the whole empire, by universal and systematic laws, which he deemed strong enough to form a bulwark for the people against oppression on the part of the government. Feeble as this theoretic bulwark of law was found to be on great emergencies, it must be owned that, in the ordinary course of public affairs, it was not ineffectual,

and that it mainly contributed to prevent the decline of the Roman empire from proceeding with that rapidity which has marked the decay of most other despotic monarchies. Constantine gave the empire a new capital; and he adopted a new religion, which, with unrivalled prudence, he rendered predominant under circumstances of great difficulty. His reforms have been supposed to have hastened the decline of the empire which they were intended to save; but the contrary was really the case. He found the empire on the eve of being broken up into a number of smaller states, in consequence of the measures which Diocletian had adopted in order to secure it against anarchy and civil war. He reunited its provinces by a succession of brilliant military achievements; and the object of his legislation appeared to be the maintenance of perfect uniformity in the civil administration by the strictest centralisation in what he termed the divine hierarchy of the imperial government. But his conduct was at variance with his policy, for he divided the executive power among his three sons and two nephews; and the empire was only saved from dismemberment or civil war by the murder of the greatest part of his family.[1] Perhaps the empire was really too extensive, and the dissimilarity of its provinces too great for executive unity, considering the imperfect means of communication which then existed, in a society which neither admitted the principle of hereditary succession nor of primogeniture, in the transmission of the imperial dignity.

The permanent success of Constantine's reforms depended on his financial arrangements, supplying ample funds for all the demands of the administration. This fact indicates some similarity between the political condition of his government and the present state of most European monarchies, and may render a close study of the errors of his financial arrangements not without profit to modern statesmen. The sums required for the annual service of the imperial government were immense; and in order to levy as great an amount of revenue from his subjects as possible, Constantine revised the census of all the taxes, and carried their amount as high as he possibly could. Every measure was adopted to transfer the whole circulating medium of the empire annually into the coffers of the State. No economy or industry could enable his subjects to accumulate wealth; while any accident, a fire, an inundation, an earthquake, or a hostile incursion of the barbarians,

[1] Constantine II., Constantius, Constans, Dalmatius and Hannibalianus.

might leave a whole province incapable of paying its taxes, and plunge it in hopeless debt and ruin.

In general the outward forms of taxation were very little altered by Constantine, but he rendered the whole fiscal system more regular and more stringent; and during no period was the maxim of the Roman government, that the cultivators of the soil were nothing but the instruments for feeding and clothing the imperial court and the army, more steadily kept in view.[1] All privileges were abolished; the tribute, or land-tax, was levied on the estates of all Roman subjects; and in the concessions made to the church, measures were usually adopted to preserve the rights of the fisc. A partial exemption of the property of the clergy was conceded by Constantine, in order to confer on the Christian priesthood a rank equal to that of the ancient senators; but this was so contrary to the principles of his legislation that it was withdrawn in the reign of Constantius. A great change in the revision of the general register of taxation must have taken place in the year 312, throughout the whole Roman empire; but as Constantine was not then sole emperor, it is evident that the financial policy of his reign, with which it appears to be closely connected, was the continuation of a system already completely organised. The absorbing interest of taxation to the subjects of the Roman empire rendered the revision of the census from this time the ordinary method of chronological notation. Time was reckoned from the first year, or Indictio, of the new assessment, and when the cycle of fifteen years was completed, a new revision took place, and a new cycle was commenced; the people thus taking no heed of the lapse of time except by noting the years of similar taxation.[2] Constantine, it is true, passed many laws to protect his subjects from the oppression of the tax-gatherers; but the number and nature of these laws afford the strongest proof that the officers of the court, and the administration, were vested with powers too extensive to be used with moderation, and that all the vigilance of the emperor was required to prevent their destroying the source of the public revenues by utterly ruining the tax-payers.[3] Instead of reducing the numbers of the imperial household, and reform-

[1] Julian, *Orat.* ii. 92, edit. Span.

[2] The period is calculated from 1st September, 312, and Constantine defeated Maxentius and entered Rome on the 27th October of that year. The year is termed, from the tax, *Indictio*. Documents in which this manner of marking time is used, often contain no means of ascertaining their date beyond the year of the indiction. There are traces of this cycle of indictions at an earlier period.—*Ideler*. ii. 350.

[3] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxv. 4.

ing the expenses of the court, in order to increase the fund available for the civil and military service of the State, Constantine added to the burden of an establishment which already included a large and useless population, by indulging in the most lavish ornament and sumptuous ceremonial. It is evident that he regarded the well-paid offices of his court as baits to allure and attach the civil and military leaders to his service. His measures were successful; and from this time rebellions became less frequent, for the majority of public officials considered it more advantageous to intrigue for advancement than to risk their lives and fortunes in civil war. Nothing reveals more fully the state of barbarism and ignorance to which the Roman world had fallen; the sovereign sought to secure the admiration of his people by outward show; he held them incapable of judging of his conduct, which was guided by the emergencies of his position. The people, no longer connected with the government, and knowing only what passed in their own province, were terrified by the magnificence and wealth which the court displayed; and, hopeless of any change for the better, they regarded the emperor as an instrument of divine power.

The reforms of Constantine required additional revenues. Two new taxes were imposed, which were regarded as the greatest grievances of his reign, and frequently selected as characteristic of his internal policy. These taxes were termed the Senatorial tax, and the Chrysargyron. The first alienated the aristocracy, and the second excited the complaints of every class of society, for it was a tax on profits, and it was levied in the severest manner on every species of receipts.[1] All the existing constitutions, ordinary and extraordinary, and all the monopolies and restrictions affecting the sale of grain, were retained. The exactions of prior governments were stretched to the utmost.[2] All the presents and gifts which had usually been made to former sovereigns were exacted by Constantine as a matter of right, and regarded as ordinary sources of revenue.

The subjection of Greece to the Roman municipal system forms an epoch in Hellenic history of great social importance: but it was effected so silently that the facts and dates which mark the progress of this political revolution cannot be traced with accuracy. The law of Caracalla, which conferred the rights of citizenship on all the provincials, annihilated the dis-

[1] Zosimus, ii. 38. [2] Amm. Marcell. xvii. 3. *Cod. Theodos.* xi. t. 28.

tinctive privileges of the Roman colonies, the old municipia, and the Greek free cities. A new municipal organisation, more conformable to a central despotism, was gradually introduced over the whole empire, by which the national ideas and character of the Greeks were ultimately much modified. The legislation of Constantine stamped the municipal institutions of the empire with the fiscal character, which they retained as long as the empire existed; and his laws inform the historian that the influence of the city republic of ancient Hellas had already ceased. Popular opinion had disappeared from Greek society as completely as political liberty from Greece. The change which transformed the ancient language into its Romaic representative, had commenced, and a modern Greek nation was consolidating its existence; disciplined to despotism, and boasting that it was composed of Romans and not of Greeks. The inhabitants of Athens and Sparta, the Achaians, Ætolians, Dorians, and Ionians, lost their distinctive characteristics, and were blended into one dull mass of uniformity as citizens of the fiscal municipalities of the empire, and as Romaic Greeks.

It is only necessary in this work to describe the general type of the municipal organisation which existed in the provinces of the Roman empire after the time of Constantine, without entering on the many doubtful questions that arise in examining the subject in detail. The proprietors of land in the Roman provinces generally dwelt in towns and cities, as a protection against brigands and man-stealers. Every town had an agricultural district which formed its territory, and the landed proprietors constituted the municipality. The whole local authority was vested in an oligarchical senate called the *Curia*, consisting probably of one hundred of the wealthiest landed proprietors in the city or township. This body elected the municipal authorities and officers, and filled up vacancies in its own body. It was therefore independent of the proprietors from among whom it was taken, and whose interests it ought to have represented. The curia—not the body of landed proprietors—formed therefore the Roman municipality. The curia was used by the imperial government as an instrument of fiscal extortion, and as a means of preventing too great a concentration of opposition against the central administration in the collection of taxes. The curia was intrusted with the collection of the land-tax, and its members were rendered responsible for the amount. As they were the

wealthiest men of the place, no curial was allowed to change his condition or quit the place of his residence.[1]

The other free inhabitants of the municipal district, who were not liable to the land-tax, but only paid the capitation—merchants, tradesmen, artists, and labourers—formed a separate and inferior class, and were called tributaries, as distinguished from proprietors. They had no connection with the curia, but were formed into corporations and trade-guilds.[2]

As the wealth and population of the Roman empire declined, the operation of the municipal system became more oppressive. The chief attention of the imperial governors in the provinces was directed to preventing any diminution in the revenue, and the Roman legislation attempted to enforce the payment of the ancient amount of land-tax and capitation from a declining and impoverished population. Laws were enacted to fix every class of society in its actual condition with regard to the revenue. The son of a member of the curia was bound to take his father's place; the son of a landed proprietor could neither become a tradesman nor a soldier, unless he had a brother who could replace his father as a payer of the land-tax. The son of an artisan was bound to follow his father's profession, that the amount of the capitation might not be diminished. Every corporation or guild had the power of compelling the children of its members to complete its numbers. Fiscal conservatism became the spirit of Roman legislation. To prevent the land beyond the limits of a municipality from falling out of cultivation, by the free inhabitants of the rural districts quitting their lands in order to better their condition in the towns, the laws gradually attached them to the soil, and converted them into serfs.

In this state of society the emperor, the imperial officials, and the army, felt the danger of rebellion, and to prevent it, both the tributaries and the landed proprietors were carefully disarmed. The military class was separated from the landed proprietors by an inseparable barrier. No landed proprietor could become a soldier, and no soldier could become a member of a curia. When the free population of the empire was so much diminished that it became difficult to find recruits, the son of a soldier was bound to follow the profession of arms.

In order to protect the tax-payers against the exactions of

[1] The Curiales were called also Decuriones.
[2] Savigny, *Geschichte des Romeischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, i. 75.

the imperial governors, fiscal agents and military officers, it became necessary that every municipality should have an official protector, whose duty it was to watch the conduct of the civil and judicial authorities and of the fiscal officers. He was called a defensor, and was elected by all the free citizens of the township, both tributaries and proprietors. No municipal senator or curial could hold the office of defensor, as it might be his duty to appeal to the emperor against the exactions of the curia, as well as against the oppressive conduct of a provincial governor or judge.

Such was the municipal organisation which supplanted the city communities of ancient Greece, and extinguished the spirit of Hellenic life. The free action, both of the physical and intellectual powers, of the Greeks was fettered by these new social bonds. We can read many curious details relating to the system in the Theodosian code, and in the legislation of Justinian; and we can trace its effects in the ruins of the Western Empire, and in the torpidity of the Greek mind on all political questions in the Eastern Empire.[1]

Municipalities henceforward began to be regarded as a burden rather than a privilege. Their magistrates formed an aristocratic class in accordance with the whole fabric of the Roman constitution. These magistrates had willingly borne all the burdens imposed on them by the State as long as they could throw the heaviest portion of the load on the people over whom they presided. But the people at last became too poor to lighten the burden of the rich, and the government found it necessary to force every wealthy citizen to enter the curia, and make good any deficiency in the taxes of the district from his own private revenues. As the Roman empire declined, the members of one curia after another sank to the same level of general poverty. It required little more than a century from the reign of Constantine to effect the ruin of the western provinces; but the social condition of the eastern, and the natural energy of the Greek character, saved them from the same fate.

The principle adopted by the Roman government in all its relations with the people and with the municipalities, was in every contested case to assume that the citizens were always endeavouring to evade burdens which they were well able to bear. This feeling sowed the seeds of hatred to the imperial administration in the hearts of its subjects, who, seeing that

[1] See the references in Savigny.

they were excluded from every hope of justice in fiscal questions, became often eager to welcome the barbarians.[1]

In Greece the old system of local governments was not entirely eradicated, though it was modified on the imperial model; but every fiscal burden was as rigorously enforced by the imperial government, whenever it tended to relieve the treasury from any expense; but, at the same time, all those privileges which had once alleviated the pressure of the revenue law, in particular districts, were now abolished. The destruction of the great oligarchs, who had rendered themselves proprietors of whole provinces in the earlier days of the Roman domination, was now effected. A number of small properties were created at the same time that a moral improvement took place in Greek society by the influence of Christianity. The higher classes became less corrupt, and the lower more industrious. This change enabled the eastern provinces to bear their fiscal burdens with more ease than the western.

The military organisation of the Roman armies was greatly changed by Constantine; and the change is peculiarly remarkable, as the barbarians were adopting the very principles of tactics which the emperors found it necessary to abandon. The system of the Roman armies, in ancient times, was devised to make them efficient on the field of battle. As the Romans were always invaders, they knew well that they could at last force their enemies to decide their differences in a pitched battle. The frontiers of the empire required a very different method for their defence. The chief duty of the army was to occupy an extended line against an active enemy, far inferior in the field. The necessity of effecting rapid movements of the troops, in bodies varying continually in number, became a primary object in the new tactics. Constantine remodelled the legions, by reducing the number of men to fifteen hundred; and he separated the cavalry entirely from the infantry, and placed them under a different command. He increased the number of the light troops, instituted new divisions in the forces, and made considerable modifications in the armour and weapons of the Romans. This change in the army was in some degree rendered necessary by the difficulty which the government experienced,

[1] *Cod. Theodos.* xi. t. 36, l. 6, &c. To escape from their fiscal burdens the members of municipalities often became hermits and monks; and the emperors ordered them to be dragged from their retreats and forced to resume their station in the municipality.—*Cod. Theod.* xii. l. 36. *Cod. Justin.* x. 31, 26.

in raising a sufficient number of men of the class and strength necessary to fill the ranks of the legions, according to the old system. It became necessary to choose between diminishing the number of the troops, or admitting an inferior class of soldiers into the army.[1] Motives of economy, and the fear of the seditious spirit of the legions, also dictated several changes in the constitution of the forces. From this time the Roman armies were composed of inferior materials, and the northern nations began to prepare themselves for meeting them in the field of battle.

The opposition which always existed between the fiscal interest of the Roman government and of the provincials, rendered any intimate connection or community of feeling between the soldiers and the people a thing to be cautiously guarded against by the emperor. The interests of the army required to be kept carefully separated from those of the citizens; and when Constantine, from motives of economy, withdrew a large number of the troops from the camps on the frontiers, and placed them in garrison in the towns, their discipline was relaxed, and their license overlooked, in order to prevent them from acquiring the feelings of citizens.[2] As the barbarians were beyond the influence of any provincial or political sympathies, and were sure to be regarded as enemies by every class in the empire, they became the chosen troops of the emperors.[3] These favourites soon discovered their own importance, and behaved with as great insolence as the prætorian bands had ever displayed.[4]

The necessity of preventing the possibility of a falling off in the revenue, was, in the eyes of the imperial court, of as much consequence as the maintenance of the efficiency of the army. Proprietors of land, and citizens of wealth, were not allowed to enrol themselves as soldiers, lest they should escape from paying their taxes; and only those plebeians and peasants who were not liable to the land-tax were taken as recruits.[5] When Rome conquered the Greeks the armies of the republic consisted of Romans, and the conquered provinces supplied the republic with tribute to maintain these armies; but when the rights of citizenship were extended to the provincials, it became the

1 *Cod. Theodos.* vii. t. 18, l. 4.
2 Zosimus, ii. 34.
3 Amm. Marcell. xix. 11.
4 Ib. xiv. 10; xv. 5.
5 Naudet corrects Gibbon's opinion (iii. 65) that "every proprietor was obliged either to take up arms, or to procure a substitute, or purchase his exemption by the payment of a heavy fine."—*Sur les Changemens dans l'Administration de l'Empire Romain*, ii. 175. *Cod. Theod.* viii. 4, 30, sect. 2. *Cod. Justin.* x. 32, 17—"Qui derelicta curia militaverit revocetur ad curiam."

duty of the poor to serve in person, and of the rich to supply the revenues of the State. The effect of this was, that the Roman forces were often recruited with slaves, in spite of the laws frequently passed to prohibit this abuse; and, not long after the time of Constantine, slaves were often admitted to enter the army on receiving their freedom.[1] The subjects of the emperors had therefore little to attach them to their government, which was supported by mercenary troops composed of barbarians and slaves, and in all the provinces the inhabitants were carefully disarmed.[2]

Section II

THE CONDITION OF THE GREEKS WAS NOT IMPROVED BY CONSTANTINE'S REFORMS

The general system of Constantine's government was by no means favourable to the advancement of the Greeks as a nation. His new division of the empire into four prefectures neutralised, by administrative arrangements, any influence that the Greeks might acquire, from the union which their language and manners naturally produced in a large portion of the population. The four prefectures of the empire were the Orient, Illyricum, Italy, and Gaul, and a prætorian prefect directed the civil administration of each of these great divisions of the empire. The prefectures were divided into governments, and these governments were again subdivided into provinces.[3] The prefecture of the Orient embraced five governments: the first was called by the name of the prefecture, the Orient; the others were Egypt, Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. In all these, the Greeks formed only a section of the population, and their influence was controlled by the adverse prejudices and interests of the natives. The prefecture of Illyricum consisted of three governments, Achaia, Macedonia, and Dacia. Achaia retained the honour of being governed by a proconsul. This distinction was only shared with the government called Asia, for there were now only two proconsular provinces; but Achaia was poor, and it was not of sufficient

[1] *Cod. Theod.* vii. t. 18, l. 4. *Cod. Just.* vii. t. 13, l. 4. *Novell.* 81.

[2] The sale of arms was absolutely prohibited.—Solos autem fieri et vendi a privatis et privatis vendi permittimus cultellos minores, quibus nullus in præliis utitur. *Digest.* xlvii. 6, 2, 2; *Novell.* 85. Even in the time of Augustus, provincials and barbarians had been admitted into the army.—Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 24; Suetonius, *August* 40. Freedmen supplied recruits for the city cohorts in the time of Nero.—Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii. 27.

[3] See the table in Gibbon, ii. 315, Smith's edit.

extent and importance to be subdivided. It embraced the Peloponnesus and the continent south of Thessaly and Epirus, occupying nearly the limits of the present kingdom of Greece. Macedonia included six provinces,—two Macedonias, Crete, Thessaly, Old Epirus, and New Epirus. In these two governments of Achaia and Macedonia, the population was almost entirely Greek. In Dacia, or the provinces between the Danube and Mount Hæmus, the Adriatic and the Black Sea, the civilised portion of the inhabitants was more imbued with the language and prejudices of Rome than of Greece. The proconsular government of Asia was separated from the prætorian prefectures, and placed under the immediate authority of the emperor. It included two provinces, the Hellespont and the islands between Greece and Asia Minor. Its native population was entirely Greek.[1]

The Greek population had been losing ground in the east since the reign of Hadrian. Pescennius Niger had shown that national feelings might be roused against the oppression of Rome, without adopting Hellenic prejudices. The establishment of the kingdom of Palmyra by Odenathus, and the conquest of Syria and Egypt, gave a severe blow to the influence of the Greeks in these countries. Zenobia, it is true, cultivated Greek literature, but she spoke Syriac and Coptic with equal fluency; and when her power was overthrown, she appears to have regretted that the advice of her Greek councillors had induced her to adopt ambitious projects unconnected with the immediate interests of her native subjects, and she abandoned them to the vengeance of the Romans. Her armies were composed of Syrians and Saracens; and in the civil administration, the natives of each province claimed an equal rank with the Greeks. The cause of the Greek population, especially in Syria and Egypt, became from this time more closely connected with the declining power of Rome; and as early as the reign of Aurelian, immediately after he had conquered Zenobia, an attempt was made, by a portion of the native population in Egypt, to throw off the Roman yoke, and put an end to Greek influence. The rebellion of Firmus is almost neglected in the history of the numerous rival emperors who were subdued by Aurelian; but the very fact that he was styled by his conqueror a robber,

[1] "Notitia dignitatum Imperii Romani." The language of Thrace, dialects of which appear to have been spoken in many districts from Thessaly to Dacia, seems to have had a closer affinity to Latin than to Greek.

and not a rival, shows that his cause made him a deadly enemy.[1]

These signs of nationality could not be overlooked by Constantine, and the political organisation of the empire was rendered more efficient than it had formerly been to crush the smallest manifestations of national feeling among any body of its subjects. On the other hand, nothing was done by Constantine with the direct view of improving the condition of the Greeks. Two of his laws have been much praised for their humanity; but they really afford the strongest proofs of the miserable condition to which the inhumanity of the government had reduced the people; and though these laws, doubtless, granted some relief to Greece, they originated in views of general policy. By the one, the collectors of the revenue were prohibited, under pain of death, from seizing the slaves, cattle, and instruments of agriculture, of the farmer, for the payment of his taxes; and, by the other, all forced labour at public works was ordered to be suspended during seed-time and harvest.[2] The agriculture and commerce of Greece had derived some advantage from the tranquillity they had enjoyed during the widespread civil wars which preceded the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine. But as far as the imperial government was concerned, commerce still suffered from the old spirit of neglect, and was circumscribed by monopoly. The officers of the palace, and even the Christian clergy, were allowed to carry merchandise from one province to another, free from the duties which fell heavily on the regular trader.[3] It was not, indeed, until the reign of Valentinian III. that the clergy were finally prohibited from engaging in commerce.[4] The emperor was himself both a merchant and manufacturer; and his commercial operations contributed materially to impoverish his subjects, and to diminish the internal trade of his dominions. The imperial household formed a numerous population, separated from the other subjects of the empire; and the imperial officers endeavoured to maintain this host, and the immense military establishment, with the smallest possible outlay of public money. The public posts furnished the means of transporting merchandise free of expense, and the officers charged with its conveyance availed themselves of this opportunity to enrich

[1] Vopiscus. Probus.
[2] *Cod. Theodes.* 11, 30, 1. *Cod. Just.* viii. 17, 7; xi. 47, 1.
[3] *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 2, 7.
[4] A.D. 452. *Novell.* lib. ii. 12.

themselves, by importing whatever they could sell with profit. Imperial manufactories supplied those goods which could be produced in the empire; and there can be little doubt that private manufacturers would seldom venture to furnish the same articles, lest their trade should interfere with the secret sources of profit of some powerful officer. These facts sufficiently explain the rapid decline in the trade, manufactures, and general wealth of the population of the Roman empire which followed the transference of the capital to Constantinople. Yet, while commerce was thus ruined, the humble and honest occupation of the shopkeeper was treated as a dishonourable profession, and his condition was rendered doubly contemptible. He was made the serf of the corporation in which he was inscribed, and his industry was fettered by restrictions which compelled him to remain in poverty. The merchant was not allowed to travel with more than a limited sum of money, under pain of exile.[1] This singular law must have been adopted, partly to secure the monopolies of the importing merchants, and partly to serve some interest of the officers of government, without any reference to the general good of the empire.

Though the change of the capital from Rome to Constantinople produced many modifications in the government, its influence on the Greek population was much less than one might have expected. The new city was an exact copy of old Rome. Its institutions, manners, interests, and language, were Roman; and it inherited all the isolation of the old capital, and stood in direct opposition to the Greeks, and all the provincials. It was inhabited by senators from Rome. Wealthy individuals from the provinces were likewise compelled to keep up houses at Constantinople, pensions were conferred upon them, and a right to a certain amount of provisions from the public stores was annexed to these dwellings. Eighty thousand loaves of bread were distributed daily to the inhabitants of Constantinople. The claim to a share in this distribution, though granted as a reward for merit, in

1 *Cod. Theod.* ix. 23, 1. The law says one thousand folles. The follis was used to indicate a sum of 125 miliaresia, as the Turks now use the expression a purse for 500 piastres. As there were 60 or 70 miliaresia to a pound of silver at this time, the sum would be equal to about £5600 sterling. The copper coin called follis was, at the date of the law, A.D. 356, the 24th part of a miliaresion. Gibbon was so puzzled by these extremes that he conjectured there must have been another follis of an intermediate value, but this does not seem necessary. The merchants of the East required considerable sums in specie for their trade.—Naudet, ii. 119, 316. Dureau de la Malle, i. 119. Gibbon, iv. 74, note 27.

some cases was rendered hereditary, but at the same time made alienable by the receiver, and was always strictly attached to the possession of property in the city. This distribution consequently differed in its nature from the distributions bestowed at Rome on poor citizens who had no other means of livelihood.[1] The tribute of grain from Egypt was appropriated to supply Constantinople, and that of Africa was left for the consumption of Rome. We here discover the tie which bound the new capital to the cause of the emperors, and an explanation of the toleration shown by the emperors to the factions of the circus, and the disorders of the populace. The emperor and the inhabitants of the capital felt that they had a common interest in supporting the despotic power by which the provinces were drained of money to supply the luxurious expenditure of the court, and to furnish provisions and amusements for the people; and, consequently, the tumults of the populace never induced the emperors to weaken the influence of the capital; nor did the tyranny of the emperors ever induce the citizens of the capital to demand the systematic circumscription of the imperial authority.

Even the change of religion produced very little improvement in the imperial government. The old evils of Roman tyranny were perpetrated under a more regular and legal despotism, and a purer religion, but they were not less generally oppressive. The government grew daily weaker as the people grew poorer; the population rapidly diminished, and the framework of society became gradually disorganised. The regularity of the details of the administration rendered it more burdensome; the obedience enforced in the army had only been obtained by the deterioration of its discipline. The barrier which the empire opposed to the ravages of the barbarians, became, consequently, weaker under each succeeding emperor.

[1] Gibbon, ii. 300, with Dr. Smith's note correcting Naudet's opinion. *Des Secours publics chez les Romains. Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, tom. xiii., which I had adopted in the first edition of this work. Compare Socrates. *Hist. Eccles.* ii. sect. 13, with *Phot. Bibl.* No. 257, p. 475, edit. Bekker. *Cod. Theod.* xiv. 17, 12, 13. *Cod. Just.* xi. 23, 1.

Section III

Changes produced in the social condition of the Greeks by the alliance of Christianity with their national manners

The decline of Roman influence, and of the supremacy of the Roman government, brought about some favourable conjunctures for the Greeks to improve their condition. Christianity connected itself with the social organisation of the people, without meddling with their political condition; but, in so doing, it everywhere awakened the feelings of humanity, and soon produced a marked improvement in the social as well as in the moral and religious position of the Greeks. Though Christianity failed to arrest the decline of the Roman empire, it reinvigorated the popular mind, and reorganised the people, by giving them a powerful and permanent object on which to concentrate their attention, and an invariable guide for their conduct in every relation of life. As it was long confined chiefly to the middle and lower classes of society, it was compelled, in every different province of the empire, to assume the language and usages of the locality, and thus it combined individual attachments with universal power. It must be observed that a great change took place in the feelings and conduct of the Christians from the period that Constantine formed a political alliance with the church, and constituted the clergy into a corporate body. The great benefits which the inhabitants of the Roman empire had previously derived from the connection of their bishops and presbyters with local national feelings, was then neutralised. The church became a political institution of the Roman empire, dependent, like every other department of the public administration, on the emperor's authority; and henceforward, whenever the ministers and teachers of the Christian religion became closely connected with national feelings, they were accused of heresy.

Paganism had undergone a great change about the time of the establishment of the Roman empire. A belief in the resurrection of the body had begun to spread, both among the Romans and the Greeks; and it is to the prevalence of this belief that the great success of the worship of Serapis, and the adoption of the practice of burying the dead in a sarcophagus of marble instead of burning it on a funeral pile,

are to be attributed.[1] The decline of paganism had proceeded far before Christianity was preached to the Greeks. The ignorance of the people on the one hand, and the speculations of the philosophers on the other, had already almost succeeded in destroying all reverence for the ancient gods of Greece, and for their worship, which rested more on mythological and historical recollections, and on associations derived from and connected with art, than on moral principles or mental conviction. The paganism of the Greeks was a worship identified with particular tribes, and with precise localities; and the want of this local and material union had been constantly felt by the Greeks of Asia and Alexandria, and had tended much to introduce those modifications in the national faith by which the Alexandrine philosophers attempted to unite it with their metaphysical views. Many Greeks and Romans had learned just ideas of religion from the Jews. "They had acquired true notions of the divine nature, and of the duties which God requires of man."[2] While, on the other hand, a religion which could deify Caligula, Nero, Domitian, and Commodus, must have fallen into contempt with all reflecting men; and even those who believed in its claims to superhuman authority must have regarded it with hatred, as having formed an unjust alliance with their tyrants. It is not, therefore, surprising that a disbelief in the gods of the empire was general among the people throughout the East. But it is impossible for man to exist in society without some religious feeling. The worship of the gods was therefore immediately replaced by a number of superstitious practices, borrowed from foreign nations, or by the revival of the traditions of a ruder period, relating to an inferior class of spirits.

The wealth of the temples in Greece, and the large funds appropriated to public feasts and religious ceremonies, kept up an appearance of devotion; but a considerable portion of these funds began to be enjoyed as the private fortunes of the hereditary priests, or was diverted, by the corporations charged with their administration, to other purposes than the service of the temples, without these changes exciting any complaints. The progressive decline of the ancient religion is marked by

[1] Serapis was the god of futurity, and the judge of the dead. Visconti has shown that the practice of burial had commenced in the time of Augustus.—*Museo, Pio Clem.* T. v. 10.

[2] Arnold observes that they are called the "devout" in the Acts of the Apostles, x. 2, xiii. 50, xvii. 4, 17; also xiii. 43, xvi. 14, xviii. 7. *Hist. of the later Roman Commonwealth*, 511, American edit.

the numerous laws which the emperors were compelled to pass against secret divination, and the rites of magicians, diviners, and astrologers. Though these modes of prying into futurity had always been regarded by the Romans and the Greeks as impious, and hostile to the religion of the State, and been strictly forbidden by public laws, they continued to gain ground under the empire.[1] The contempt of the people for the ancient religion as early as the time of Trajan was shown by their general indifference to the rites of sacrifice, and to the ceremonials of their festivals.[2] While the great struggle with Christianity was openly carried on, this was peculiarly remarkable. The emperor Julian often complains, in his works, of this indifference, and gives rather a ludicrous instance of its extent in an anecdote which happened to himself. As emperor and Pontifex Maximus, he repaired to the temple of Apollo at Daphne, near Antioch, on the day of the great feast. He declares that he expected to see the temple filled with sacrifices, but he found not even a cake, nor a grain of incense; and the god would have been without an offering had the priest himself not brought a goose, the only victim which Apollo received on the day of his festival. Julian proves, by this anecdote, that all the population of Antioch was Christian, otherwise curiosity would have induced a few to visit the temple.[3]

The laws of the moral world prevent any great reformation in society from being effected, without the production of some positive evil. The best feelings of humanity are often awakened in support of very questionable institutions; and all opinions hallowed by the lapse of time become so endeared by old recollections, that the most self-evident truths are frequently overlooked, and the greatest benefits to the mass of mankind are peremptorily rejected, when their first announcement attacks an existing prejudice. No principles of political wisdom, and no regulations of human prudence, could therefore have averted the many evils which attended the change of religion in the Roman empire, even though that change was from fable to truth, from paganism to Christianity.

[1] Bonamy, *Du Rapport de la Magie avec la Théologie Païenne. Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, vii. 25. Suetonius, *Tiber.* c. 63. *Cod. Theodos.* ix. 16. See before, page 96.

[2] Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97.—"Prope jam desolata templa sacra—solennia diu intermissa."

[3] Even at Athens paganism had ceased to be publicly practised before Julian ascended the throne.—Libanius, *in Julian. necem*, p. 288, edit. Morell. The contending influence of Christianity and paganism on the municipal authorities of the Greek cities, might perhaps be illustrated by a careful study of the "Acts of the Saints."

The steady progress which Christianity made against paganism, and the deep impression it produced on the middle classes of society, and on the votaries of philosophy, are certainly wonderful, when the weight of prejudice, the wealth of the temples, the pride of the schoolmen, and the influence of college endowments, are taken into consideration. Throughout the East, the educated Greeks, from the peculiar disposition of their minds, were easily led to grant an attentive hearing to the promulgators of new doctrines and systems. Even at Athens, Paul was listened to with great respect by many of the philosophers; and after his public oration to the Athenians at the Areopagus, some said, "We will hear thee again of this matter." A belief that the principle of unity, both in politics and religion, must, from its simplicity and truth, lead to perfection, was an error of the human mind extremely prevalent at the time that Christianity was first preached. That one according spirit might be traced in the universe, and that there was one God, the Father of all, was a very prevalent doctrine.[1] This tendency towards despotism in politics, and deism in religion, is a feature of the human mind which continually reappears in certain conditions of society and corruptions of civilisation. At the same time a very general dissatisfaction was felt at these conclusions; and the desire of establishing the principle of man's responsibility, and his connection with another state of existence, seemed hardly compatible with the unity of the divine essence adored by the philosophers. Deism was indeed the prevailing opinion in religion, yet it was generally felt that it did not supply the void created by the absence of belief in the power of the ancient pagan divinities, who had been supposed to pervade all nature, to be ever present on the earth or in the air, that they might watch the actions of men with sympathies almost human. The influence of deism was cold and inanimate, while an affectation of superior wisdom almost invariably induced the philosophers to introduce some maxim into their tenets adverse to the plain common-sense of mankind, which abhors paradox. The people felt that the moral corruption of which the pagan Juvenal, in his intense indignation, has given us so many vivid descriptions, must eventually destroy all

[1] Maximus Tyrius, *Diss.* xvii. *Quarterly Review*, July, 1840—"Alexandria and the Alexandrines."—The analogy which it was supposed ought to exist between the government of earth and heaven, induced the army, at a later period, to demand that the imperial power should be vested in three emperors, in order that the Trinity might be represented.

social order. A reformation was anxiously desired, but no power existed capable of undertaking the work. At this crisis Christianity presented itself, and offered men the precise picture of the attributes of God of which they were in search; it imposed on them obligations of which they acknowledged the necessity, and it required from them a faith, of which they gradually recognised the power.

Under these circumstances, Christianity could not fail of making numerous converts. It boldly announced the full bearing of truths, of which the Greek philosophers had only afforded a dim glimpse; and it distinctly contradicted many of the favourite dreams of the national but falling faith of Greece. It required either to be rejected or adopted. Among the Greeks, therefore, Christianity met everywhere with a curious and attentive audience. The feelings of the public mind were dormant; Christianity opened the sources of eloquence, and revived the influence of popular opinion. From the moment a people, in the state of intellectual civilisation in which the Greeks were, could listen to the preachers, it was certain they would adopt the religion. They might alter, modify, or corrupt it, but it was impossible that they should reject it. The existence of an assembly, in which the dearest interests of all human beings were expounded and discussed in the language of truth, and with the most earnest expressions of persuasion, must have lent an irresistible charm to the investigation of the new doctrine among a people possessing the institutions and feelings of the Greeks. Sincerity, truth, and a desire to persuade others, will soon create eloquence where numbers are gathered together. Christianity revived oratory, and with oratory it awakened many of the national characteristics which had slept for ages. The discussions of Christianity gave also new vigour to the communal and municipal institutions, as it improved the intellectual qualities of the people.

The injurious effect of the demoralisation of society prevalent throughout the world on the position of the females, must have been seriously felt by every Grecian mother. The educated females in Greece, therefore, naturally welcomed the pure morality of the Gospel with the warmest feelings of gratitude and enthusiasm; and to their exertions the rapid conversion of the middle orders must in some degree be attributed. Female influence must not be overlooked, if we would form a just estimate of the change produced in society by the conversion of the Greeks to Christianity.

The effect of Christianity extended to political society, by the manner in which it enforced the observance of the moral duties on every rank of men without distinction, and the way in which it called in the aid of public opinion to enforce that self-respect which a sense of responsibility is sure to nourish. This political influence of Christianity soon displayed itself among the Greeks. They had always been deeply imbued with a feeling of equality, and their condition, after their conquest by the Romans, had impressed on them the necessity of a moral code, to which superiors and inferiors, rulers and subjects, were equally amenable. The very circumstances, however, which gave Christianity peculiar attractions for the Greeks, excited a feeling of suspicion among the Roman official authorities. Considering, indeed, the manner in which the Christians formed themselves into separate congregations in all the cities and towns of the East, the constituted form which they gave to their own society, entirely independent of the civil authority in the State, the high moral character, and the popular talents, of many of their leaders, it is not wonderful that the Roman emperors should have conceived some alarm at the increase of the new sect, and deemed it necessary to exterminate it by persecution. Until the government of the empire was prepared to adopt the tenets of Christianity, and identify itself with the Christian population, it was not unnatural that the Christians should be regarded as a separate, and consequently inimical class; for it must be confessed that the bonds of their political society were too powerful to allow any government to remain at ease. Let us, for a moment, form a picture of the events which must have been of daily occurrence in the cities of Greece. A Christian merchant arriving at Argos or Sparta would soon excite attention in the *agora* and the *lesche*. His opinions would be examined and controverted. Eloquence and knowledge were by no means rare gifts among the traders of Greece, from the time of Solon the oil-merchant. The discussions which had been commenced in the markets would penetrate into the municipal councils. The smaller states in alliance with the empire, like Athens and Sparta, and the free cities generally, would be roused to an unwonted energy, and the Roman governors astonished and alarmed.[1]

[1] We see something which admits of a comparison in the moral condition of Mussulman society in the Othoman empire at present. The same deep-rooted corruption has produced the same conviction that all human measures of reform will prove inadequate.

It was, undoubtedly, the power of the Christians as a political body which excited several of the persecutions against them; and the accusation to which they were subjected, of being the enemies of the human race, was caused by their enforcing general principles of humanity at variance with the despotic maxims of the Roman government. The emperor Decius, the first great persecutor of Christianity, is reported to have declared that he would rather divide his throne with another emperor, than have it shared by the bishop of Rome.[1] When the cry of popular hatred was once excited, accusations of promiscuous profligacy, and of devouring human sacrifices, were the calumnious additions, in accordance with the credulity of the age.[2] The first act of legal toleration which the Christians met with from the Roman government, was conceded to their power as a political party by Maxentius.[3] They were persecuted and tolerated by Maximin, according to what he conceived to be the dictates of his interest for the time. Constantine, who had long acted as the leader of their political party, at last seated Christianity on the throne, and, by his prudence, the world for many years enjoyed the happiness of religious toleration.[4]

From the moment Christianity was adopted by the Hellenic race, it was so identified with the habits of the people as to become essentially incorporated with the subsequent history of the nation. The earliest corporations of Greek Christians were united in distinct bodies by civil as well as by religious ties. The members of each congregation assembled not only for divine worship, but also when any subject of general interest required their opinion or decision; and the everyday business of the community was intrusted to their spiritual teachers, and to the most influential individuals in the society. It is impossible to determine exactly the limits of the authority of the clergy and the elders in the various Christian communities during the first century. As there was usually a perfect concord on every subject, precise regulations, either to settle the bounds of clerical authority, or the form of administering the business of the society, could not be considered necessary. It cannot, indeed, be supposed that one uniform course of proceeding was adopted for the internal government of all the

1 Gibbon, ii. 261.
2 "Epulæ Thyesteæ, promiscuus concubitus, odium generis humani."
3 Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* viii. c. 14; ix. c. 9.
4 Tzschirner, *Der Fall des Heidenthums*, Leip. 1829. Beugnot, *Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident*, 2 vols.; Paris, 1835.

Christian communities throughout the world. Such a thing would have been too much at variance with the habits of the Greeks and the nature of the Roman empire. Circumstances must have rendered the government of the Christian churches, in some parts of the East, strictly monarchical; while, in the municipalities of Greece, it would certainly appear more for the spiritual interests of religion, that even the doctrines of the society should be discussed according to the forms used in transacting the public business of these little autonomous cities. Such differences would excite no attention among the cotemporary members of the respective churches, for both would be regarded as equally conformable to the spirit of Christianity. Precise laws and regulations usually originate in the necessity of preventing definite evils, so that principles of action operate as guides to conduct, and exert a practical influence on the lives of thousands, for years before they become embodied in public enactments.

The most distant communities of Christian Greeks in the East were connected by the closest bonds of union, not only for spiritual purposes, but also on account of the mutual protection and assistance which they were called upon to afford one another in the days of persecution. The progress of Christianity among the Greeks was so rapid, that they soon surpassed in numbers, wealth, and influence, any other body separated, by peculiar usages, from the mass of the population of the Roman empire. The Greek language became the ordinary medium of communication on ecclesiastical affairs in the East; and the Christian communities of Greeks were gradually melted into one nation, having a common legislation and a common civil administration in many things, as well as a common religion. Their ecclesiastical government thus acquired a moral force which rendered it superior to the local authorities, and which at last rivalled the influence of the political administration of the empire. The Greek church had grown up to be almost equal in power to the Roman state, before Constantine determined to unite the two in strict alliance.

This power had received a regular organisation as early as the second century. Deputies from the different congregations in Greece met together at stated intervals and places, and formed provincial synods, which replaced the Achaian, Phocic, Bœotic, and Amphictyonic assemblies of former days.[1] How these assemblies were composed, what part the people took in

[1] Tertullian, *De Jejun.* p. 650; Paris, 1580. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 19.

the election of the clerical deputies, and what rights the laity possessed in the provincial councils, are points which have been much disputed, and do not yet seem to be very accurately determined. The people, the lay elders, and the clergy or spiritual teachers, were the component parts of each separate community in the earliest periods.[1] The numbers of the Christians soon required that several congregations should be formed in a single city; these congregations sought to maintain a constant communication, in order to secure perfect unanimity. Deputies were appointed to meet for this purpose; and the most distinguished and ablest member of the clergy naturally became the president of this assembly. He was the bishop, and soon became charged with the conduct of public business during the intervals between the meetings of the deputies. The superior education and character of the bishops placed the direction of the greater part of the civil affairs of the community in their hands; ecclesiastical business was their peculiar province by right; they possessed the fullest confidence of their flocks; and, as no fear was then entertained that the power intrusted to these disinterested and pious men could ever be abused, their authority was never called in question.

When Christianity became the religion of the emperor, the political organisation and influence of the Christian communities could not fail to arrest the attention of the Roman authorities. The provincial synods replaced, in the popular mind, the older national institutions; and, in a short time, the power of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria excited the jealousy of the emperors themselves. The monarchical ideas of the eastern Greeks vested extensive authority in the hands of their bishops and patriarchs; and their power excited more alarm in the Roman government than the municipal forms of conducting ecclesiastical business which were adopted by the natives of Greece, in accordance with the civil constitutions of the Greek cities and states. This fact is evident from an examination of the list of the martyrs who perished in the persecutions of the third century, when political alarm, rather than religious zeal, moved the government to acts of cruelty. While numbers were murdered in Antioch, Alexandria, Cæsarea, Smyrna, and Thessalonica, very few were sacrificed at Corinth, Athens, Patras, and Nicopolis.[2]

[1] Acts of the Apostles vi. 2; xv.

[2] *Menologium Græcorum jussu Basilii Imp. editum*; Urbini, 1727. Fallmerayer, i. 110. Zinkeisen, 604.

Christianity formed a confederation of communities in the heart of the eastern portion of the Roman empire, in avowed opposition to some of the political maxims of the State. The power which Christianity had acquired, evidently exercised some influence in determining Constantine to transfer his capital into that part of his dominions where so numerous and powerful a body of his subjects were attached to his person and his cause. Both Constantine and the Christians had their own grounds of hostility to Rome and the Romans. The senate and the Roman nobility remained firmly attached to paganism, which was converted into the bond of union of the conservative party in the western portion of the empire, and thus the Greeks were enabled to secure a predominancy in the Christian church. The imperial prejudices of Constantine appear to have concealed from him this fact; and he seems never to have perceived that the cause of the Christian church and the Greek nation were already closely interwoven, unless his inclination to Arianism, in his latter days, is to be attributed to a wish to suppress the national spirit, which began to display itself in the Eastern Church. The policy of circumscribing the power of orthodoxy, as too closely connected with national feelings, was more openly followed by Constantius.

The numbers of the Christians in the Roman empire at the time of the first general council of the Christian church at Nice, is a subject of great importance towards affording a just estimation of many historical facts. If the conjecture be correct, that the Christians, at the time of Constantine's conversion, hardly amounted to a twelfth, and perhaps did not exceed a twentieth part of the population of the empire, this would certainly afford the strongest proof of the admirable civil organisation by which they were united.[1] But this can hardly be considered possible, when applied to the eastern provinces of the empire, and is certainly incorrect with regard to the Greek cities. It seems established by the rescript of Maximin, and by the testimony of the martyr Lucianus—supported as these are by a mass of collateral evidence—that the Christians formed, throughout the East, the majority of the middle classes of Greek society.[2] Still history affords few facts which supply a fair criterion to estimate the numbers or strength of either the Christian or pagan population generally

[1] Labastie, *4me. Mémoire sur le Souverain Pontificat des Empereurs Romains. Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.* xv. 77.

[2] Milman, however, doubts the fact of the Christians forming a majority of the population in the East.—*History of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 21; Paris edit.

throughout the empire. The imperial authority, supported by the army, which was equally destitute of religion and nationality, was powerful enough to oppress or persecute either party, according to the personal disposition of the emperor. There were Christians who endeavoured to excite Constantius to persecute the pagans, and to seize the wealth which their temples contained.[1] Constantine had found himself strong enough to carry off the gold and silver statues and ornaments from many temples; but, as this was done with the sanction and assistance of the Christian population where it occurred, it seems probable that it only happened in those places where the whole community, or at least the corporation possessing the legal control over the temporal concerns of these, had embraced Christianity.[2] An arbitrary exercise of the emperor's authority as Pontifex Maximus, for the purpose of plundering the temples he was bound to protect, cannot be suspected; it would be too strongly at variance with the systematic toleration of Constantine's reign.

The pagan Julian was strongly incited to persecute the Christians by the more fanatical of the pagans; nor did he himself ever appear to doubt that his power was sufficient to have commenced a persecution; and, consequently, he takes credit to himself, in his writings, for the principles of toleration which he adopted.[3] The attempt of Julian to re-establish paganism was, however, a very unstatesmanlike proceeding, and exhibited the strongest proof that the rapidly decreasing numbers of the pagans proclaimed the approaching dissolution of the old religion. Julian was an enthusiast; and he was so far carried away by his ardour as to desire the restoration of ceremonies and usages long consigned to oblivion, and ridiculous in the eyes of his pagan contemporaries. In the East he accelerated the ruin of the cause which he espoused. His own acquaintance with paganism had been gained chiefly from books, and from the lessons of philosophers; for he had long been compelled to conform to Christianity, and to acquire his knowledge of paganism only by stealth. When he acted the Pontifex Maximus, according to the written instructions of the old ceremonial, he was looked upon as the pedantic reviver of an antiquated ceremony. The religion, too, which he had studied, was that of the ancient Greeks,—a

1 Beugnot, i. 149. 2 Eusebius, *Laud. Const.* c. 8.

3 Julian, *Epist.* 41, p. 98. Beugnot gives a clear and fair view of the tolerant policy of Julian's reign—*Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident.*

system of belief which had irrevocably passed away. With the conservative pagan party of Rome he never formed any alliance. The fancy of Julian to restore Hellenism, and to call himself a Greek, was therefore regarded by all parties in the empire as an imperial folly. Nothing but princely ignorance of the state of opinion in his age could have induced Julian to endeavour to awaken the national feelings of the Greeks in favour of paganism, in order to oppose them to Christianity, for their nationality was already engaged in the Christian cause. This mistaken notion of the emperor was seen by the Romans, and made a strong impression on the historians of Julian's reign. They have all condemned his superstition; for such, in their eyes, his fanatic imitation of antiquated Hellenic usages appeared to be.[1]

We must not overlook the important fact that the Christian religion was long viewed with general aversion, from being regarded by all classes as a dangerous as well as secret political association. The best informed heathens appear to have believed that hostility to the established order of society, *odium humani generis*, as this was called by the Romans, was a characteristic of the new religion. The Roman aristocracy and populace, with all those who identified themselves with Roman prejudices, adopted the opinion that Christianity was one of the causes of the decline of the Roman empire. Rome was a military state, Christianity was a religion of peace. The opposition of their principles was felt by the Christians themselves, who seem to have considered that the success of Christianity implied the fall of the empire; and as the duration of the empire and the existence of civilised society appeared inseparable, they inferred that the end of the world was near at hand. Nor is this surprising. The invasion of the barbarians threatened society with ruin; no political regeneracy seemed practicable by means of any internal reforms; the empire of Christ was surely approaching, and that empire was not of this world.

But these opinions and reasonings were not so prevalent in the East as in the West, for the Greeks especially were not under the influence of the same political feelings as the Romans. They were farther removed from the scenes of war, and they suffered less from the invasions of the barbarians. They were occupied with the daily business of life, and their attention was not so frequently diverted to the crimes of the

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxv. 4. Aurelius Victor, *Epit.* Eutropius.

emperors and the misfortunes of the State. They felt no sympathy, and little regret, when they perceived that the power of Rome was on the decline, for they deemed it probable that they should prove gainers by the change.

One feature of Christian society which excited general disapprobation about the time of the accession of Julian, was the great number of men who became monks and hermits. These enemies of social life proclaimed that it was better to prepare for heaven in seclusion, than to perform man's active duties, and to defend the cause of civilisation against the barbarians. Millions of Christians who did not imitate their example openly approved of their conduct; so that it is not wonderful that all who were not Christians regarded Christianity with aversion, as a political institution hostile to the existing government of the Roman empire. The corruptions of Christianity, and the dissensions of the Christians, had also caused a reaction against the religion, towards the latter part of the reign of Constantius II. Julian profited by this feeling, but he had not the talent to render it subservient to his views. The circumstance which rendered Christianity most hateful to him, as an emperor and a philosopher, was the liberty of private judgment assumed as one of the rights of man by monks and theologians. To combat Christianity with any chance of success, Julian must have connected the theoretic paganism of the schools with moral principles and strong faith. To succeed in such a task, he must have preached a new religion, and assumed the character of a prophet. He was unequal to the enterprise, for he was destitute of the popular sympathies, firm convictions, fiery enthusiasm, and profound genius of Mahomet.[1]

Section IV

The Orthodox Church became identified with the Greek nation

When Constantine embraced Christianity, he allowed paganism to remain the established religion of the State, and left the pagans in the possession of all their privileges. The principle of toleration was received as a political maxim of the Roman government; and it continued, with little

[1] Neander (*Julian and his Generation*) fills up, very ably, Gibbon's able account of the apostate.

interruption, to be so, until the reign of Theodosius the Great, who undertook to abolish paganism by legislative enactments. The Christian emperors continued, until the reign of Gratian, to bear the title of Pontifex Maximus, and to act as the political head of the pagan religion. This political supremacy of the emperor over the pagan priesthood was applied also to the Christian church; and, in the reign of Constantine, the imperial power over the external and civil affairs of the church was fully admitted by the whole Christian clergy. The respect which Constantine showed to the ministers of Christianity, never induced him to overlook this supremacy. Even in the general council of Nice, the assembled clergy would not transact any business until the emperor had taken his seat, and authorised them to proceed. All Constantine's grants to the church were regarded as marks of imperial favour; and he considered himself entitled to resume them, and transfer them to the Arians. During the Arian reigns of Constantius and Valens, the power of the State over the church was still more manifest.[1]

From the death of Constantine until the accession of Theodosius the Great, a period of thirty years elapsed, during which Christianity, though the religion of the emperors, and of a numerous body of their subjects, was not the religion of the State. In the western provinces, paganism was still predominant; and even in the eastern provinces, which had embraced Christianity, the Christian party was weakened by rival sects. The Arians and orthodox regarded one another with as much hostility as they did the pagans. During this period, the orthodox clergy were placed in a state of probation, which powerfully contributed towards connecting their interests and feelings with those of the Greek population. Constantine had determined to organise the Christian church precisely in the same manner as the civil government. The object of this arrangement was to render the church completely subservient to the imperial administration, and to break, as much as possible, its connection with the people. For this purpose, the higher ecclesiastical charges were rendered independent of public opinion. The wealth and temporal power which the clergy suddenly attained by the favour of Constantine, soon produced the usual effects of sudden riches and irresponsible

[1] Eusebius, *De Vita Constant. Mag.* iv. 24. He told the bishops that they were appointed to teach the doctrine of the church, but that he was the supreme bishop for its government.

authority in corrupting the minds of men. The disputes relating to the Arian heresy were embittered by the eagerness of the clergy to possess the richest episcopal sees, and their conflicts became so scandalous, that they were rendered a subject of popular satire in places of public amusement.[1] The favour shown by the Arian emperors to their own party, proved ultimately beneficial to the orthodox clergy. The Roman empire was still nominally pagan, the Roman emperors were avowedly Arian, and the Greeks felt little disposed to sympathise with the traditional superstitions of their conquerors, or the personal opinions of their masters. During this period, therefore, they listened with redoubled attention to the doctrines of the orthodox clergy, and from this time the Greek nation and the orthodox church became closely identified.

The orthodox teachers of the Gospel, driven from the ecclesiastical preferments which depended on court favour, and deserted by the ambitious and worldly-minded clergy, cultivated those virtues, and pursued that line of conduct, which had endeared the earlier preachers of Christianity to their flocks. The old popular organisation of the church was preserved, and more completely amalgamated with the social institutions of the Greek nation. The people took part in the election of their spiritual pastors, and influenced the choice of their bishops. The national as well as the religious sentiments of the Greeks were called into action, and provincial synods were held for the purpose of defending the orthodox priesthood against the imperial and Arian administration. The majority of the orthodox congregations were Greek, and Greek was the language of the orthodox clergy. Latin was the language of the court and of the heretics. Many circumstances, therefore, combined to consolidate the connection formed at this time between the orthodox church and the Greek population throughout the eastern provinces of the empire; while some of these circumstances tended more particularly to connect the clergy with the educated Greeks, and to lay the foundation of the orthodox church becoming a national institution.

In ancient Hellas and the Peloponnesus, paganism was still far from being extinct, or, at least, as was not unfrequently the case, the people, without caring much about the ancient religion, persisted in celebrating, with some enthusiasm, the

[1] Eusebius, *De Vita Constant. Mag.* l. ii. 61.

rites and festivals consecrated by antiquity.[1] Valentinian and Valens renewed the laws which had been often passed against various pagan rites; and both of these emperors encouraged the persecution of those who were accused of this imaginary crime. It must be observed, however, that these accusations were generally directed against wealthy individuals; and, on the whole, they appear to have been dictated by the old imperial maxim of filling the treasury by confiscations in order to avoid the dangers likely to arise from the imposition of new taxes.[2] In Greece, the ordinary ceremonies of paganism often bore a close resemblance to the prohibited rites; and the new laws could not have been enforced without causing a general persecution of paganism, which does not appear to have been the object of the emperors. The proconsul of Greece, himself a pagan, solicited the emperor Valens to exempt his province from the operation of the law; and so tolerant was the Roman administration, when the district was too poor to offer a rich harvest for the fisc, that Greece was allowed to continue to celebrate its pagan festivals.[3]

Until this period, the temples had generally preserved all their property and revenues administered by private individuals, and drawn from sources unconnected with the public treasury. The rapid destruction of the temples, which took place after the reign of Valens, must have been caused, in a great measure, by the conversion of those intrusted with their care to Christianity. When the hereditary priests seized the revenues of the heathen god as a private estate, they would rejoice in seeing the temple fall rapidly to ruin, if they did not dare to destroy it openly. Towards the end of his reign the Emperor Gratian laid aside the title of Pontifex Maximus, and removed the altar of Victory from the senate-house of Rome.[4] These acts were equivalent to a declaration that paganism was no longer the acknowledged religion of the senate and the Roman people. It was Theodosius the Great, however, who finally established Christianity as the religion of the empire; and in the East he succeeded completely in uniting the orthodox church with the imperial administration: but in the West, the power and prejudices of the Roman aristocracy prevented his measures from attaining full success.

Theodosius, in rendering orthodox Christianity the estab-

[1] Beugnot, vol. ii. p. 162, note b.
[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxx. 1, 9. Zosimus, iv. 13.
[3] Zosimus, iv. 3.
[4] A.D. 383. Clinton, *Fasti Rom.* vol. ii. 122.

lished religion of the empire, increased the administrative and judicial authority of the bishops; and the Greeks, being in possession of a predominant influence in the orthodox church, were thus raised to the highest social position which subjects were capable of obtaining. The Greek bishop, who preserved his national language and customs, was now the equal of the governor of a province, who assumed the name and language of a Roman. The court, as well as the civil administration of Theodosius the Great, continued Roman; and the Latin clergy, aided by the great power and high character of St. Ambrose, prevented the Greek clergy from appropriating to themselves an undue share of ecclesiastical authority and preferment in the West. The power now conferred on the clergy, supported as it was by the popular origin of the priesthood, by the feelings of brotherhood which pervaded the Greek church, and by the strong attachment of their flocks, was generally employed to serve and protect the people, and often succeeded in tempering the despotism of the imperial authority. The clergy began to form a part of the State. A popular bishop could hardly be removed from his diocese, without the government incurring as much danger as it formerly encountered in separating a successful general from his army. The difficulties which the Emperor Constantine met with, in removing St. Athanasius from the See of Alexandria, and the necessity he was under of obtaining his condemnation in a general council, show that the church, even at that early period, already possessed the power of defending its members; and that a new power had arisen which imposed legal restraints on the arbitrary will of the emperor. Still, it must not be supposed that bishops had yet acquired the privilege of being tried only by their peers. The emperor was considered the supreme judge in ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters, and the council of Sardica was satisfied with petitioning for liberty of conscience, and freedom from the oppression of the civil magistrate.[1]

Though the good effects of Christianity on the moral and political condition of the ancient world have never been called in question, historians have, nevertheless, more than once

[1] A.D. 347. The "Constantinus non ausus est de causa episcopi judicare" is an idle phrase of St. Augustine.—Milman's *Hist. of Christ.* vol. ii. p. 36, 297; Paris edit. *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 2, 12. Compare the rescript of Constantine, Baronius. *Ann. Eccl.* A.D. 329, viii.—where he says, in speaking of the disputes of Athanasius and Eusebius to the provincial synod, "Sestri est, non mei judicii de ea re cognoscere,"—with his saying as reported by Eusebius, in the preceding note at page 142.

reproached the Christian religion with accelerating the decline of the Roman empire. A careful comparison of the progress of society in the eastern and western provinces must lead to a different conclusion. It appears certain that the Latin provinces were ruined by the strong conservative attachment of the aristocracy of Rome to the forgotten forms and forsaken superstitions of paganism, after they had lost all practical influence on the minds of the people; while there can be very little doubt that the eastern provinces were saved by the unity with which all ranks embraced Christianity. In the Western Empire, the people, the Roman aristocracy, and the imperial administration, formed three separate sections of society, unconnected either by religious opinion or national feelings; and each was ready to enter into alliances with armed bands of foreigners in the empire, in order to serve their respective interests, or gratify their prejudices or passions. The consequence of this state of things was, that Rome and the Western Empire, in spite of their wealth and population, were easily conquered by comparatively feeble enemies; while Constantinople, with all its original weakness, beat back both the Goths and the Huns, in the plenitude of their power, in consequence of the union which Christianity inspired. Rome fell because the senate and the Roman people clung too long to ancient institutions, forsaken by the great body of the population; while Greece escaped destruction because she modified her political and religious institutions in conformity with the opinions of her inhabitants, and with the policy of her government. The popular element in the social organisation of the Greek people, by its alliance with Christianity, infused into society the energy which saved the Eastern Empire; the disunion of the pagans and Christians, and the disorder in the administration flowing from this disunion, ruined the Western.

Section V

Condition of the Greek Population of the Empire, from the Reign of Constantine to that of Theodosius the Great

The establishment of a second capital at Constantinople has generally been considered a severe blow to the Roman empire; but, from the time of Diocletian, Rome had ceased

to be the residence of the emperors. Various motives induced the emperors to avoid Rome; the wealth and influence of the Roman senators circumscribed their authority; the turbulence and numbers of the people rendered even their government insecure; while the immense revenues required for donatives, for distributions of provisions, for pompous ceremonies, and for public games, formed a heavy burden on the imperial treasury, and the insubordination of the prætorian guards continually threatened their persons. When the emperor, therefore, by becoming a Christian, was placed in personal opposition to the Roman senate, there could be no longer any doubt that Rome became a very unsuitable residence for the Christian court. Constantine was compelled to choose a new capital; and in doing so he chose wisely. His selection of Byzantium was, it is true, determined by reasons connected with the imperial administration, without any reference to the influence which his choice might have on the prosperity of his subjects. Its first effect was to preserve the unity of the Eastern Empire. The Roman empire had, for some time previous to the reign of Constantine, given strong proofs of a tendency to separate into a number of small states. The necessity of the personal control of the sovereign over the executive power in the provinces, was so great, that Constantine himself, who had done all he could to complete the concentration of the general government, thought it necessary to divide the executive administration of the empire among his family before his death. The union effected by centralising the management of the army and the civil and judicial authority, prevented the division of the executive power from immediately partitioning the empire. It was not until the increased difficulties of intercommunication had created two distinct centres of administration that the separation of the Eastern and Western empires was completed.

The foundation of Constantinople was the particular act which secured the integrity of the eastern provinces, and prevented their separating into a number of independent states. It is true, that by transferring the administration of the East more completely into the hands of the Greeks, it roused the nationality of the Syrians and Egyptians into activity,—an activity, however, which seemed to present no danger to the empire, as both these provinces were peopled almost exclusively by a tax-paying population, and contributed proportionally few recruits to the army. The establishment

of the seat of government at Constantinople enabled the emperors to destroy many abuses, and effect numerous reforms, which recruited the resources and revived the strength of the eastern portion of the empire. The energy thus developed gave to the empire of the East the strength which enabled it ultimately to repulse all those hordes of barbarians who subdued the West.

Society underwent some modifications in the East, in consequence of the change of the capital. It acquired a more settled and stationary form. Before the reign of Constantine, ambition had been the leading feature of the Roman state. Everybody was striving for official rank; and the facilities of ascending the throne, or arriving at the highest dignities, were indefinitely multiplied by the rapid succession of emperors, by the repeated proscriptions of senators, and by the incessant confiscations of the property of the wealthiest Romans. Constantine, in giving to the government the form of a regular monarchy, introduced greater stability into society; and as ambition could no longer be gratified with the same ease as formerly, avarice, or rather rapacity, became the characteristic feature of the ruling classes. This love of riches soon caused the venality of justice. The middle classes, already sinking under the general anarchy and fiscal oppression of the empire, were now exposed to the extortions of the aristocracy, and property became almost as insecure among the smaller proprietors as it had formerly been among those who held great estates.

The condition of Greece, nevertheless, improved considerably in the interval which elapsed between the invasion of the Goths in the reign of Gallienus and the time of Constantine. History, it is true, supplies only a few scattered incidents from which the fact of this improvement can be inferred: but the gradual progress of the amelioration is satisfactorily established. When Constantine and Licinius prepared to dispute the sole possession of the empire, they assembled two powerful fleets, both of which were composed chiefly of Greek vessels. The armament of Constantine consisted of two hundred light galleys of war, and two thousand transports, and these immense naval forces were assembled at the Piræus. This selection of the Piræus as a naval station indicates that it was no longer in the desolate condition in which it had been seen by Pausanias in the second century, and it shows that Athens itself had recovered from whatever injury it had

sustained during the Gothic expedition. To these frequent reconstructions of the buildings and walls of Greek cities, caused by the vicissitudes which frequently occurred in the numbers and wealth of their inhabitants during the period of eight centuries and a half which is reviewed in this volume, we are to attribute the disappearance of the immense remains of ancient constructions which once covered the soil, and of which no traces now exist, as they have been broken up on these occasions to serve as materials for new structures.

The fleet of Constantine was collected among the Europeans; that of Licinius, which consisted of triremes, was furnished chiefly by the Asiatic and Libyan Greeks. The number of the Syrian and Egyptian vessels was comparatively smaller than would have been the case two centuries earlier. It appears, therefore, that the commerce of the Mediterranean had returned into the hands of the Greeks. The trade of central Asia, which took the route of the Black Sea, had increased in consequence of the insecure state of the Red Sea, Egypt, and Syria, and had given an impulse to Greek industry.

The carrying trade of western Europe was again falling into Greek hands. Athens, as the capital of the old Hellenic population, from its municipal liberty and flourishing schools of learning, was rising into importance. Constantine honoured this city with marks of peculiar favour, which were conferred certainly from a regard to its political importance, and not from any admiration of the studies of its pagan philosophers. He not only ordered an annual distribution of grain to be made to the citizens of Athens, from the imperial revenues, but he accepted the title of Strategos when offered by its inhabitants.

As soon as Julian had assumed the purple in Gaul, and marched against Constantius, he endeavoured to gain the Greek population to his party, by flattering their national feelings; and he strove to induce them to connect their cause with his own, in opposition to the Roman government of Constantius. He seems, in general, to have been received with favour by the Greeks, though his aversion to Christianity must have excited some distrust. Unless the Greek population in Europe had greatly increased in wealth and influence, during the preceding century, or Roman influence had suffered a considerable diminution in the East, it could hardly have entered into the plans of Julian to take the prominent

measures which he adopted to secure their support. He addressed letters to the municipalities of Athens, Corinth, and Lacedæmon, in order to persuade these cities to join his cause. The letter to the Athenians is a carefully prepared political manifesto explaining the reasons which compelled him to assume the purple. Athens, Corinth, and Lacedæmon, must have possessed some acknowledged political and social influence in the empire, otherwise Julian would only have rendered his cause ridiculous by addressing them at such a critical moment; and, though he was possibly ignorant of the state of religious feeling in the popular mind, he must have been too well acquainted with the statistics of the empire to commit any error of this kind in public business. It may also be observed, that the care with which history has recorded the ravages caused in Greece by earthquakes, during the reigns of Valentinian and Valens, affords conclusive testimony of the importance then attached to the well-being of the Greek population.[1]

The ravages committed by the Goths in the provinces immediately to the south of the Danube must have turned for a time to the profit of Greece. Though some bands of the barbarians pushed their incursions into Macedonia and Thessaly, still Greece generally served as a place of retreat for the wealthy inhabitants of the invaded districts.[2] When Theodosius, therefore, subdued the Goths, the Greek provinces, both in Europe and Asia, were among the most flourishing portions of the empire; and the Greek population, as a body, was, without question, the most numerous and best organised part of the Emperor's subjects; property, in short, was nowhere so secure as among the Greeks.

The rapacity of the imperial government had, however, undergone no diminution; and the weight of taxation was still compelling the people everywhere to encroach on the capital accumulated by former ages, and to abstain from all investments which only promised a distant remuneration.[3] The influx of wealth from the ruined provinces of the North, and the profits of a change in the direction of trade, were temporary causes of prosperity, and could only render the burden of the public taxes lighter for one or two generations.

[1] Ammianus Marcell. xxvi. 10. Zosimus, iv. 18.

[2] Zosimus, iv. 20. Eunapius, p. 51, edit. Bonn.

[3] It is needless to accumulate proofs of the nature of the fiscal administration of this period,—every page of history offers them. Julian, as an emperor, is a good authority: "Rapere non accipere sciunt agentes in rebus."—Amm. Mar. xvi. 15.

The imperial treasury was sure ultimately to absorb the whole of these accidental supplies. It was, indeed, only in the ancient seats of the Hellenic race that any signs of returning prosperity were visible; for in Syria, Egypt, and Cyrene, the Greek population displayed evident proofs that they were suffering in the general decline of the empire. Their number was gradually diminishing in comparison with that of the native inhabitants of these countries. Civilisation was sinking to the level of the lower grades of society. In the year A.D. 363, the Asiatic Greeks received a blow from which they never recovered. Jovian, by his treaty with Sapor II., ceded to Persia the five provinces of Arzanene, Moxoene, Zabdicene, Rehimene, and Corduene, and the Roman colonies of Nisibis and Singara in Mesopotamia. As Sapor was a fierce persecutor of the Christians, the whole Greek population of these districts was obliged to emigrate. The bigoted attachment of the Persians to the Magian worship never allowed the Greeks to regain a footing in these countries, or to obtain again any considerable share in their trade. From this time the natives acquired the complete ascendancy in all the country beyond the Euphrates. The bigotry of the Persian government is not to be overlooked in estimating the various causes which drove the trade of India through the northern regions of Asia to the shores of the Black Sea.

Section VI

Communications of the Greeks with countries beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire

It would be a depressing idea were it to be admitted that the general degradation of mankind after the time of the Antonines was the effect of some inherent principle of decay, proceeding from an inevitable state of exhaustion in the condition of a highly civilised society; that a moral deficiency produced incurable corruption, and rendered good government impracticable; that these evils were irremediable, even by the influence of Christianity; and, in short, that the destruction of all the elements of civilisation was necessary for the regeneration of the social as well as the political system. But there is haply no ground for any such opinion. The evils of society were produced by the injustice and oppression of the Roman government, and that government

was unfortunately too powerful to enable the people to force it to reform its conduct. The middle classes were almost excluded from all influence in their own municipal affairs by the oligarchical constitution of the curia, so that public opinion was powerless. After the Roman central authority was destroyed, similar causes produced the same effects in the barbarian monarchies of the West; and the revival of civilisation commenced only when the people had acquired power sufficient to enforce some respect for their feelings and rights. History has fortunately preserved some scanty memorials of a Greek population living beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, which afford the means of estimating the effects of political causes in modifying the character and destroying the activity of the Greek nation. The flourishing condition of the independent Greek city of Cherson, in Tauris, furnishes ample testimony that the state of society among the Greeks admitted of the existence of those virtues, and of the exercise of that energy, which are necessary to support independence; but without institutions which confer on the people some control over their government, and some direct interest in public affairs, nations soon sink into lethargy, from which they can only be roused by war.

The Greek city of Chersonesos, a colony of Heraclea in Pontus, was situated on a small bay to the south-west of the entrance into the great harbour of Sevastopol, a name now memorable in European history.[1] The defeat of Mithridates, to whom it had been subject, did not re-establish its independence. But in the time of Augustus it possessed the privileges of freedom and self-government under the protection of Rome. Its distant and isolated situation protected it from the arbitrary exactions of Roman magistrates, and rendered its municipal rights equivalent to political independence. In the reign of Hadrian, this independence was officially recognised, and it received the rank of an allied city. In the third century we find the name of Chersonesos contracted into Cherson, and the city removed somewhat to the eastward of the old site. Its extent was diminished, and the fortifications of Cherson only embraced a circumference of about two miles, on the promontory to the west of the present Quarantine harbour or bay. It preserved the republican form of government of the Greek states, and contrived to defend its freedom for centuries against the ambition of the kings of

[1] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* lib. iv. c. 26.

Bosporus, and the attacks of the neighbouring Goths, who had rendered themselves masters of the open country. The wealth and power of Cherson depended on its commerce, and this commerce flourished under institutions which guaranteed the rights of property. The Emperor Constantine, in his Gothic wars, did not disdain to demand the aid of this little State; and he acknowledged with gratitude the great assistance which the Roman empire had derived from the military forces of the Chersonites. No history could present more instructive lessons to centralised despotisms than the records of the administration and taxation of these Greeks, in the Tauric Chersonesus, during the decline of the empire, and it is deeply to be regretted that none exists. About three hundred and fifty years before the Christian era, the kingdom of the Cimmerian Bosporus, one of these Greek colonies, was in a flourishing agricultural condition; and its monarch had been able to prevent a famine at Athens, by supplying that city with two million bushels of wheat in a single season.[1] Three hundred and fifty years after the birth of Christ all was changed in ancient Greece, and Cherson alone of all the cities inhabited by Greeks enjoyed the blessing of freedom. The fertile fields which had fed the Athenians were converted into pasturage for the cattle of the Goths; but the commerce of the Chersonites enabled them to import corn, oil, and wine from the richest provinces of the Roman empire.

The commercial Greeks of the empire began to feel that there were countries in which men could live and prosper beyond the power of the Roman administration. Christianity had penetrated far into the East, and Christians were everywhere united by the closest ties. The speculations of trade occupied an important place in society. Trade carried many Greeks of education among foreign nations little inferior to the Romans in civilisation, and surpassing them in wealth. It was impossible for these travellers to avoid examining the conduct of the imperial administration with the critical eye of men who viewed various countries and weighed the merits of different systems of fiscal government. For them, therefore, oppression had certain limits from which, when transgressed, they would have escaped by transporting themselves and their fortunes beyond the reach of the imperial taxgatherers. The inhabitants of the Western Empire could entertain no similar hope of avoiding oppression.

[1] Boeckh's *Public Economy of Athens*, I, 121.

About the time of Constantine, the Greeks carried on an extensive commerce with the northern shores of the Black Sea, Armenia, India, Arabia, and Ethiopia, and some merchants carried their adventures as far as Ceylon. A Greek colony had been established in the island of Socotra (Dioscorides), in the time of the Ptolemies, as a station for the Indian trade; and this colony, mixed with a number of Syrians, still continued to exist, in spite of the troubles raised by the Saracens on the northern shores of the Red Sea, and their wars with the emperors, particularly with Valens.[1] The travels of the philosopher Metrodorus, and the missionary labours of the Indian bishop Theophilus, prove the existence of a regular intercourse between the empire, India, and Ethiopia, by the waters of the Red Sea. The curiosity of the philosopher, and the enthusiasm of the missionary, were excited by the reports of the ordinary traders; while their enterprises were everywhere facilitated by the mercantile speculations of a regular traffic. Feelings of religion at this time extended the efforts of the Christians, and opened up new channels for commerce. The kingdom of Ethiopia was converted to Christianity by two Greek slaves, who rose to the highest dignities in the State, whose influence must have originated in their connection with the Roman empire, and whose power must have opened new means of communication with the heathens in the south of Africa, and assisted Greek traders, as well as Christian missionaries, in penetrating into countries whither no Roman had ever ventured.

Section VII

Effect of the Separation of the Eastern and Western Empires on the Greek Nation. A.D. 395

The separation of the eastern and western portions of the Roman empire into two independent states, under Arcadius and Honorius, was the last step, in a long series of events, which seemed tending to restore the independence of the Greek nation. The interest of the sovereigns of the Eastern

[1] Socrat. iv. 36. Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 38. The Indies were in ancient times divided into the East and West, according to their direction from the Straits of Babelmandeb; and Ethiopia is often called India. The inhabitants of Dioscorides spoke Syriac in the middle of the fourth century, and Greek, when visited by Cosmas Indicopleustes in the sixth. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, i. 441, with the notes of Saint-Martin.

Empire became intimately connected with the fortunes of their Greek subjects. The Greek language began to be generally spoken at the court of the eastern emperors, and Greek feelings of nationality gradually made their way, not only into the administration and the army, but even into the family of the emperors. The numbers of the Greek population in the Eastern Empire gave a unity of feeling to the inhabitants, a nationality of character to the government, and a degree of power to the Christian church, which were completely wanting in the ill-cemented structure of the West. New vigour seemed on the point of being infused into the imperial government, as circumstances strongly impelled the emperors to participate in the feelings and national interests of their subjects. Nor were these hopes entirely delusive. The slow and majestic decline of the Roman empire was arrested under a singular combination of events, as if expressly to teach the historical lesson that the Roman government had fallen through its own faults, by consuming the capital from which its own resources were derived, by fettering the industry of the people, and thus causing a decline in the numbers of the population; for even in the West the strength of the barbarians was only sufficient to occupy provinces already depopulated by the policy of the government.

As soon as the Eastern Empire was definitively separated from the Western, the spirit of the Greek municipalities, and the direct connection of the body of the people with the clergy, began to exercise a marked influence on the general government. The increasing authority of the defensor in the municipalities modified, in some degree, the oligarchy of the Roman curia. Though the imperial administration continued, in fiscal matters, to maintain the old axiom that the people were the serfs of the State, yet the emperors, from the want of an aristocracy whom they could plunder, were thrown back on the immediate support of the people, whose goodwill could no longer be neglected. It is not to be supposed that, in the general decline of the empire, any disorganisation of the frame of civil society was manifest in the various nations which lived under the Roman government. The numbers of the population had, indeed, everywhere diminished, but no convulsions had yet shaken the frame of society. Property was as secure as it had ever been, and the courts of law were gaining additional authority and a better organisation. Domestic virtue was by no means rarer than it had been in brighter

periods of history. The even tenor of life flowed calmly on in a great portion of the Eastern Empire, from generation to generation. Philosophical and metaphysical speculations had in the absence of the more active pursuits of political life been the chief occupation of the higher orders; and when the Christian religion became universal, it gradually directed the whole attention of the educated to theological questions. These studies certainly exercised a favourable influence on the general morality, if not on the temper of mankind, and the tone of society was characterised by a purity of manners, and a degree of charitable feeling to inferiors, which have probably never been surpassed. Nothing can more remarkably display the extent to which the principles of humanity had penetrated, than the writings of the emperor Julian. In the fervour of his pagan enthusiasm, he continually borrows Christian sentiments and inculcates Christian philanthropy.

Public opinion, which in the preceding century had attributed the decline of the empire to the progress of Christianity, now, with more justice, fixed on the fiscal system as the principal cause of its decay. The complaints of the oppression of the public administration were, by the common consent of the prince and people,. directed against the abuses of the revenue-officers. The historians of this period, and the decrees of the emperors themselves, charge these officers with producing the general misery by the peculations which they committed; but no emperor yet thought of devoting his attention to a careful reformation of the system which allowed such disorders. The indignation of the emperor, however, who threatens the agents of the treasury with death if they indulge in extortion, speaks indirectly in favour of the state of society in which the vices of the administration were so severely reprehended.[1]

An anecdote often illustrates the condition of society more correctly than a dissertation, though there is always some danger that an anecdote has found its place in history from the singularity of the picture which it presents. The one now selected seems, however, interesting, as affording a faithful picture of general manners, and as giving an accurate view of the most prominent defects in the Roman administration. Acyndinus, the prefect of the Orient, enjoyed the reputation

[1] *Cod. Theodos.* i. xvi. 7.—Cessent jam nunc rapaces officialium manus, cessent, inquam: nam si moniti non cessaverint, gladiis præcidentur. Salvian, *De Gubernatione Dei. Magna Bibliotheca Patrum*, v. 89–92.

of an able, just, and severe governor. He collected the public revenues with inflexible justice. In the course of his ordinary administration, he threatened one of the inhabitants of Antioch, already in prison, with death, in case he should fail to discharge, within a fixed term, a debt due to the imperial treasury. His power was admitted, and his habitual attention to the claims of the fisc gave public defaulters at Antioch no hope of escaping with any punishment short of slavery, which was civil death. The prisoner was married to a beautiful woman, and the parties were united by the warmest affection. The circumstances of their case, and their situation in life, excited some attention. A man of great wealth offered to pay the husband's debt, on condition that he should obtain the favours of his beautiful wife. The proposal excited the indignation of the lady, but when it was communicated to her imprisoned husband, he thought life too valuable not to be preserved by such a sacrifice; and his prayers had more effect with his wife than the wealth or the solicitations of her admirer. The libertine, though wealthy, proved to be mean and avaricious, and contrived to cheat the lady with a bag filled with sand instead of gold. The unfortunate wife, baffled in her hopes of saving her husband, threw herself at the feet of the prefect Acyndinus, to whom she revealed the whole of the disgraceful transaction. The prefect was deeply moved by the evil effects of his severity. Astonished at the variety of crimes which he had caused, he attempted to render justice, by apportioning a punishment to each of the culprits, suitable to the nature of his offence. As the penalty of his own severity, he condemned himself to pay the debt due to the imperial treasury. He sentenced the fraudulent seducer to transfer to the injured lady the estate which had supplied him with the wealth which he had so infamously employed. The debtor was immediately released—he appeared to be sufficiently punished by his imprisonment and shame.[1]

The severity of the revenue laws, and the arbitrary power of the prefects in matters of finance, are well represented in this anecdote. The injury inflicted on society by a provincial administration so constituted must have been incalculable. Even the justice and disinterestedness of such a prefect as Acyndinus required to be called into action by extraordinary crimes, and, after all, virtues such as his could afford no very sure guarantee against oppression.

[1] Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, i. 414, and the authorities referred to.

In spite of the great progress which Christianity had made there still existed a numerous body of pagans among the higher ranks of the old aristocracy, who maintained schools of philosophy, in which a species of allegorical pantheism was taught. The pure morality inculcated, and the honourable lives of the teachers in these schools, enabled these philosophers to find votaries long after paganism might be considered virtually extinct as a national religion. While the pagans still possessed a succession of distinguished literary characters, a considerable body of the Christians were beginning to proclaim an open contempt of all learning which was not contained in the Scriptures. This fact is connected with the increased power of national feelings in the provinces, and with the aversion of the natives to the oppression of the Roman government and the insolence of Greek officials. Literature was identified with Roman supremacy and Greek feelings. The Greeks, having long been in possession of the privileges of Roman citizens and calling themselves Romans, now filled the greater part of the civil employments in the East.

From the time of Constantine, the two great principles of law and religion began to exert a favourable influence on Greek society, by their effect in moderating the despotic power of the imperial administration in its ordinary communications with the people. They became institutions in the State, having a sphere of action independent of the arbitrary power of the emperor. The lawyers and the clergy acquired a fixed position, based on their organisation as political bodies; and thus the branches of government with which they were connected were, in some degree, emancipated from arbitrary changes, and obtained a systematic or constitutional form. The dispensation of justice, though it remained dependent on the executive government, was placed in the hands of a distinct class; and as the law required a long and laborious study, its administration followed a steady and invariable course, which it was difficult for any other branch of the executive to interrupt. The lawyers and judges, formed in the same school and guided by the same written rules, were placed under the influence of a limited public opinion, which at least insured a certain degree of self-respect, supported by professional interests, but founded on general principles of equity. The body of lawyers not only obtained a complete control over the judicial proceedings of the tribunals, and restrained the injustice of proconsuls and prefects, but they

ven assigned limits to the wild despotism exercised by the rlier emperors. The department of general legislation was kewise intrusted to lawyers; and the good effects of this rrangement are apparent, from the conformity of the decrees the worst emperors, after this period, with the principles of stice.

The power of the clergy, originally resting on a more opular and purer basis than that of the law, became at last o great, that it suffered the inevitable corruption of all responsible authority intrusted to humanity. The power of ie bishops almost equalled that of the provincial governors, id was not under the constant control of the imperial dministration. To gain such a position, intrigue, simony, id popular sedition were often employed. Supported by the eople, a bishop ventured to resist the emperor himself; ipported by the emperor and the people, he ventured even o neglect the principles of Christianity. Theophilus, the atriarch of Alexandria, ordained the Platonic philosopher ynesius, bishop of Ptolemaïs, in Cyrenaïca, when he was recent and not orthodox Christian; for, as a bishop, he efused to put away his wife, and he declared that he neither elieved in the resurrection of the body nor in the eternity of unishments.[1]

In estimating the relative extent of the influence exercised by w and religion on the social condition of the Greeks, it must e remarked that Greek was the language of the Eastern hurch from the time of its connection with the imperial dministration; while, unfortunately for the law, Latin con-nued to be the language of legal business in the East, until ter the time of Justinian. This fact explains the compara-vely trifling influence exercised by the legal class, in establish-ig the supremacy of the Greek nation in the Eastern Empire, id accounts also for the undue influence which the clergy ere enabled to acquire in civil affairs. Had the language the law been that of the people, the Eastern lawyers, ipported by the municipal institutions and democratic feel-igs of the Greeks, could hardly have failed, by combining ith the church, to form a systematic and constitutional barrier gainst the arbitrary exercise of the imperial authority. The ant of national institutions forming a portion of their system law, was a defect in the social condition of the Greeks hich they never supplied.

[1] Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, translated by Torrey, 702. Synesius, *Epist.* 95–105.

Slavery continued to exist in the same manner as in earli times; and the slave-trade formed the most important branc of the commerce of the Roman empire. It is true that th humanity of a philosophical age, and the precepts of th Gospel, introduced a few restraints on the most barbaro features of the power possessed by the Romans over the liv and persons of their slaves; still, freemen were sold as slav by government if they failed to pay their taxes, and paren were allowed to sell their own children. A new and mo systematic slavery than the old personal service grew up in th rural districts, in consequence of the fiscal arrangements the empire. The public registers showed the numbers of slav employed in the cultivation of every farm; and the proprieto was bound to pay a certain tax for these slaves according t their employment. Even when the land was cultivated b free peasants, the proprietor was responsible to the fisc fo their capitation-tax. As the interest of the government and the proprietor, therefore, coincided to restrain the free labourer employed in agriculture from abandoning the cultivation o the land, he was attached to the soil, and gradually sank int the condition of the serf; while, on the other hand, in th case of slaves employed in farming, the government had a interest in preventing the proprietor from withdrawing thei labour from the cultivation of the soil: these slaves, therefore rose to the rank of serfs. The cultivators of the soil became for this reason, attached to it, and their slavery ceased to b personal; they acquired rights, and possessed a definite statio in society. This was the first step made by mankind towards the abolition of slavery.[1]

The double origin of serfs must be carefully observed, i order to explain some apparently contradictory expressions o the Roman law. There is a law of Constantius preserved i Justinian's code, which shows that slaves were then attache to the soil, and could not be separated from it. There i a law, also, of the Emperor Anastasius, which proves tha a freeman, who had cultivated the property of another fo thirty years, was prohibited from quitting that property: bu he remained in other respects a freeman.[2] The cultivator was called by the Romans *colonus*, and might, consequently, be either a slave or a freeman. His condition, however, was soo

[1] On the subject of ancient slavery, see Blair, *Inquiry into the State of Slavery amongst the Romans*, Edin. 1833. *De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage ancien e Occident*, par E. Biot; and Wallon, *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité* 3 vols.

[2] *Codex Just.* "de Agric. et Cens." xi. 48. 2 and 19.

so completely determined by special laws, that its original constitution was lost.[1]

Section VIII

Attempts of the Goths to establish themselves in Greece

The first great immigration of the Goths to the south of the Danube took place with the permission of the emperor Valens; but as the Roman government adopted no measures for insuring their tranquil settlement in the country, these troublesome colonists were soon converted into dangerous enemies. Being ill supplied with provisions, finding the country unprotected, and having been allowed to retain possession of their arms, they began to plunder Mœsia, Thrace, and Macedonia, for subsistence. At last, emboldened by success, they extended their incursions over the whole country, from the walls of Constantinople to the borders of Illyria. The Roman troops were defeated. The emperor Valens, advancing inconsiderately in the confidence of victory, was vanquished in the battle of Adrianople, and perished A.D. 378. The massacre of a considerable number of Goths, retained in Asia as hostages and mercenaries, roused the fury of their victorious countrymen, and gave an unusual degree of cruelty to the war of devastation which they carried on for three years. Theodosius the Great put an end to these disorders. The Goths were still unable to resist the Roman troops when properly conducted. Theodosius induced their finest bodies of warriors to enter the imperial service, and either destroyed the remaining bands, or compelled them to escape beyond the Danube.

The depopulated state of the empire induced Theodosius to establish colonies of Goths, whom he had forced to submit, in Phrygia and Lydia. Thus the Roman government began to replace the ancient population of its provinces, which its exactions were exterminating, by introducing new races of inhabitants into its dominions. Theodosius granted peculiar

[1] Some of the opinions of Savigny, in his profound essay, *Ueber den Romeischen Colonat* (Abhand. Acad. von Berlin, 1822), seem to overlook this double origin of the condition of serfs after the time of Constantine. The interests of the revenue being against the free farmer, and in favour of the slave cultivator, naturally rendered the law cruel to the one, and humane to the other. Compare *Cod. Just.* xi. 48, 4, 6, 7, 12, 18, 23, and *Const. Justiniani*, *Justini et Tiberii*, vii. See *infra*, pp. 203–204.

privileges to the dangerous foreigners whom he introduced, and left these hordes of barbarians in possession of their national institutions, merely on condition that they should furnish a certain number of recruits for the military service of the State.[1] When the native population of the empire was gradually diminishing, some suspicion must surely have been entertained that this diminution was principally caused by the conduct of the government; yet so deeply rooted was the opposition of interests between the government and the governed, and so distrustful were the emperors of their subjects, that they preferred confiding in foreign mercenaries, to reducing the amount, and changing the nature, of the fiscal contributions, though by doing this they might have secured the support, and awakened the energy, of their native subjects.

The Roman despotism had left the people almost without any political rights to defend, and with but few public duties to perform; while the free inhabitants deplored the decline of the agricultural population, and lamented their own degeneracy, which induced them to crowd into the towns. They either did not perceive, or did not dare to proclaim, that these evils were caused by the imperial administration, and could only be remedied by a milder and more equitable system of government. In order to possess the combination of moral and physical courage necessary to defend their property and rights against foreign invasion, civilised nations must feel convinced that they have the power of securing that property and those rights against all domestic injustice and arbitrary oppression on the part of the sovereign.

The Goths had commenced their relations with the Roman empire before the middle of the third century; and during the period they had dwelt in the countries adjoining the Roman provinces, the people had made great progress in civilisation, and the chiefs in military and political knowledge.[2] From the time Aurelian abandoned to them the province of Dacia beyond the Danube, they became the lords of a fertile, cultivated, and well-peopled country. As the great body of the agricultural population had been left behind by the Romans when they vacated the province, the Goths found themselves the proprietors of lands, from which they appear to have drawn a fixed revenue, leaving the old inhabitants in the e

[1] These colonies adopted the Greek language, and the Gotho-Greeks are frequently mentioned by the Byzantine writers. *Theophanis Ch.* 323, edit. Par.

[2] *Excerpta e Petri Pat. Hist.* p. 124, edit. Bonn. A.D. 230.

joyment of their estates. To warriors of their simple habits of life, these revenues were amply sufficient to enable them to spend their time in hunting, to purchase arms and horses, and to maintain a band of retainers trained to war. The personal independence enjoyed by every Gothic warrior who possessed a landed revenue, created a degree of anarchy in the territories they subdued which was everywhere more ruinous than the systematic oppression of Rome. Still in Dacia the Goths were enabled to improve their arms and discipline, and to assume the ideas and manners of a military and territorial aristocracy. Though they remained always inferior to the Romans in military science and civil arts, they were their equals in bravery, and their superiors in honesty and truth; so that the Goths were always received with favour in the imperial service. It must not be forgotten, that no comparison ought to be established between the Gothic contingents and the provincial conscripts. The Gothic warriors were selected from a race of landed gentry devoted exclusively to arms, and which looked with contempt on all industrious occupations; while the native troops of the empire were taken from the poorest peasantry, torn from their cottages, and mingled with slaves and the dissolute classes of the cities, who were induced to enlist from hunger or a love of idleness. The number and importance of the Gothic forces in the Roman armies during the reign of Theodosius, enabled several of their commanders to attain the highest rank; and among these officers, Alaric was the most distinguished by his future greatness.[1]

The death of Theodosius threw the administration of the Eastern Empire into the hands of Rufinus, the minister of Arcadius; and that of the Western, into those of Stilicho, the guardian of Honorius. The discordant elements which composed the Roman empire began to reveal all their incongruities under these two ministers. Rufinus was a civilian from Gaul; and from his Roman habits and feelings, and western prejudices, disagreeable to the Greeks. Stilicho was of barbarian descent, and consequently equally unacceptable to the aristocracy of Rome; but he was an able and popular soldier, and had served with distinction both in the East and in the West. As Stilicho was the husband of Serena, the niece and adopted daughter of Theodosius the Great, his alliance with the imperial family gave him an unusual influence in the administration. The two ministers hated one another with all the

[1] Zosimus, v. 5.

violence of aspiring ambition; and, unrestrained by any feeling of patriotism, each was more intent on ruining his rival than on serving the State. The greater number of the officers in the Roman service, both civil and military, were equally inclined to sacrifice every public duty for the gratification of their avarice or ambition.

At this time Alaric, partly from disgust at not receiving all the preferment which he expected, and partly in the hope of compelling the government of the Eastern Empire to agree to his terms, quitted the imperial service, and retired towards the frontiers, where he assembled a force sufficiently large to enable him to act independently of all authority. Availing himself of the disputes between the ministers of the two emperors, and perhaps instigated by Rufinus or Stilicho to aid their intrigues, he established himself in the provinces to the south of the Danube. In the year 395 he advanced to the walls of Constantinople; but the movement was evidently a feint, as he must have known his inability to attack a large and populous city defended by a powerful garrison, and which even in ordinary times received the greater part of its supplies by sea. After this demonstration, Alaric marched into Thrace and Macedonia, and extended his ravages into Thessaly. Rufinus has been accused of assisting Alaric's invasion, and his negotiations with him while in the vicinity of Constantinople authorise the suspicion. When the Goth found the northern provinces exhausted, he resolved to invade Greece and Peloponnesus, which had long enjoyed profound tranquillity. The cowardly behaviour of Antiochus the proconsul of Achaia, and of Gerontius the commander of the Roman troops, both friends of Rufinus, was considered a confirmation of his treachery. Thermopylæ was left unguarded, and Alaric entered Greece without encountering any resistance.

The ravages committed by Alaric's army have been described in fearful terms; villages and towns were burnt, the men were murdered, and the women and children carried away to be sold as slaves by the Goths. But even this invasion affords proofs that Greece had recovered from the desolate condition in which it had been seen by Pausanias. The walls of Thebes had been rebuilt, and it was in such a state of defence that Alaric could not venture to besiege it, but hurried forward to Athens. He concluded a treaty with the civil and military authorities, which enabled him to enter that city without opposition; his success was probably assisted

by treacherous arrangements with Rufinus, and by the treaty with the municipal authorities, which secured the town from being plundered by the Gothic soldiers; for he appears to have really occupied Athens rather as a federate leader than as a foreign conqueror. The tale recorded by Zosimus of the Christian Alaric having been induced by the apparition of the goddess Minerva to spare Athens, is refuted by the direct testimony of other writers, who mention the capitulation of the city.[1] The fact that the depredations of Alaric hardly exceeded the ordinary license of a rebellious general, is, at the same time, perfectly established. The public buildings and monuments of ancient splendour suffered no wanton destruction from his visit; but there can be no doubt that Alaric and his troops levied heavy contributions on the city and its inhabitants. Athens evidently owed its good treatment to the condition of its population, and perhaps to the strength of its walls, which imposed some respect on the Goths; for the rest of Attica did not escape the usual fate of the districts through which the barbarians marched. The town of Eleusis, and the great temple of Ceres, were plundered and then destroyed. Whether this work of devastation was caused by the Christian monks who attended the Gothic host, and excited their bigoted Arian votaries to avenge the cause of religion on the temples of the pagans at Eleusis, because they had been compelled to spare the shrines at Athens, or whether it was the accidental effect of the eager desire of plunder, or of the wanton love of destruction, among a disorderly body of troops, is not very material. Bigoted monks, avaricious officers, and disorderly soldiers, were numerous in Alaric's band.

Gerontius, who had abandoned the pass of Thermopylæ, took no measures to defend the Isthmus of Corinth, or the difficult passes of Mount Geranion, so that Alaric marched unopposed into the Peloponnesus, and, in a short time, captured almost every city in it without meeting with any resistance. Corinth, Argos, and Sparta, were all plundered by the Goths. The security in which Greece had long remained, and the policy of the government, which discouraged their independent institutions, had conspired to leave the province without protection, and the people without arms.[2] The

[1] The manner in which Zosimus passes over the destruction of Eleusis by Alaric, saying expressly that he committed no ravages in Attica, deprives his narrative of all credit.—i. 5. *Hieronymi Ep.* 60, tom. 1, p. 343. Philostorgius, xii. 2. Claudianus, *in Rufin.* ii. 191. Synes. *Epist.* 136.

[2] Zosimus (vi. 254, edit. Bonn) has a remarkable passage indicating the defenceless

facility which Alaric met with in effecting his conquest, and his views, which were directed to obtain an establishment in the empire as an imperial officer or feudatory governor, rendered the conduct of his army not that of avowed enemies. Yet it often happened that they laid waste everything in the line of their march, burnt villages, and massacred the inhabitants.[1]

Alaric passed the winter in the Peloponnesus without encountering any opposition from the people; yet many of the Greek cities still kept a body of municipal police, which might surely have taken the field, had the imperial officers performed their duty, and endeavoured to organise a regular resistance in the country districts.[2] The moderation of the Goth, and the treason of the Roman governor, seem both attested by this circumstance. The government of the Eastern Empire had fallen into such disorder at the commencement of the reign of Arcadius, that even after Rufinus had been assassinated by the army, the new ministers of the empire gave themselves very little concern about the fate of Greece. Honorius had a more able, active, and ambitious minister in Stilicho, and he determined to punish the Goths for their audacity in daring to establish themselves in the empire without the imperial authority. Stilicho had attempted to save Thessaly in the preceding year, but had been compelled to return to Italy, after he had reached Thessalonica, by an express order of the emperor Arcadius, or rather of his minister Rufinus. In the spring of the year 396, he assembled a fleet at Ravenna, and transported his army directly to Corinth, which the Goths do not appear to have garrisoned, and where, probably, the Roman governor still resided. Stilicho's army, aided by the inhabitants, soon cleared the open country of the Gothic bands, and Alaric drew together the remains of his diminished army, in the elevated plain of Mount Pholoe, which has since served as a point of retreat for the northern invaders of Greece.[3] Stilicho contented himself with occupying the passes with his army; but his carelessness, or the relaxed discipline of his troops, soon afforded the watchful Alaric an

condition to which the Roman government had reduced the Greeks: "Καὶ αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ Σπάρτα συναπήγετο τῇ κοινῇ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλώσει, μήτε ὅπλοις ἔτι μήτε ἀνδράσι μαχίμοις τετειχισμένη διὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πλεονεξίαν."

[1] Eunapius, *in Prisc.* i. 17, edit. Boissonade.

[2] Procopius, *De Ædificiis*, iv. 2.

[3] The Albanian colony of Lalla, composed of the remains of the Albanian troops who ravaged the Morea after the defeat of the Russian invasion in 1770, and who retired to Mount Pholoe when defeated by Hassan Pasha, at Tripolitza, in 1779.

opportunity of escaping with his army, of carrying off all the plunder which they had collected, and, by forced marches, of gaining the Isthmus of Corinth.[1]

Alaric succeeded in conducting his army into Epirus, where he disposed his forces to govern and plunder that province, as he had expected to rule Peloponnesus. Stilicho was supposed to have winked at his proceedings, in order to render his own service indispensable by leaving a dangerous enemy in the heart of the Eastern Empire; but the truth appears to be, that Alaric availed himself so ably of the jealousy with which the court of Constantinople viewed the proceedings of Stilicho, as to negotiate a treaty, by which he was received into the Roman service, and that he really entered Epirus as a general of Arcadius. Stilicho was again ordered to retire from the Eastern Empire, and he obeyed rather than commence a civil war by pursuing Alaric. The conduct of the Gothic troops in Epirus was, perhaps, quite as orderly as that of the Roman legionaries; so that Alaric was probably welcomed as a protector when he obtained the appointment of Commander-in-chief of the imperial forces in Eastern Illyricum, which he held for four years.[2] During this time he prepared his troops to seek his fortune in the Western Empire.[3] The military commanders, whether Roman or barbarian, were equally indifferent to the fate of the people whom they were employed to defend; and the Greeks appear to have suffered equal oppression from the armies of Stilicho and Alaric.

The condition of the European Greeks underwent a great change for the worse, in consequence of this unfortunate plundering expedition of the Goths. The destruction of their property, and the loss of their slaves, were so great, that the evil could only have been slowly repaired under the best government, and with perfect security of their possessions. In the miserable condition to which the Eastern Empire was reduced, this was hopeless; and a long period elapsed before the mass of the population of Greece again attained the prosperous condition in which Alaric had found it; nor were some of the cities which he destroyed ever rebuilt. The ruin of roads, aqueducts, cisterns, and public buildings, erected by the accumulation of capital in prosperous and enterprising ages, was a loss which could never be repaired by a dimin-

1 Zosimus, v. 7, 26. Clinton, *Fasti Romani.*
2 Greece formed a part of Eastern Illyricum.
3 Claudianus, *De Bell. Gil.* v. 535.

ished and impoverished population. History generally preserves but few traces of the devastations which affect only the people; but the sudden misery inflicted on Greece was so great, when contrasted with her previous tranquillity, that testimonies of her sufferings are to be found in the laws of the empire. Her condition excited the compassion of the government during the reign of Theodosius II. There exists a law which exempts the cities of Illyricum from the charge of contributing towards the expenses of the public spectacles at Constantinople, in consequence of the sufferings which the ravages of the Goths, and the oppressive administration of Alaric, had inflicted on the inhabitants. There is another law which proves that many estates were without owners, in consequence of the depopulation caused by the Gothic invasions; and a third law relieves Greece from two-thirds of the ordinary contributions to government, in consequence of the poverty to which the inhabitants were reduced.[1]

This unfortunate period is as remarkable for the devastations committed by the Huns in Asia, as for those of the Goths in Europe, and marks the commencement of the rapid decrease of the Greek race, and of the decline of Greek civilisation throughout the empire. While Alaric was laying waste the provinces of European Greece, an army of Huns from the banks of the Tanais penetrated through Armenia into Cappadocia, and extended their ravages over Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia. Antioch, at last, resisted their assaults, and arrested their progress; but they took many Greek cities of importance, and inflicted an incalculable injury on the population of the provinces which they entered. In a few months they retreated to their seats on the Palus Mæotis, having contributed much to accelerate the ruin of the richest and most populous portion of the civilised world.[2]

Section IX

The Greeks arrested the conquests of the northern barbarians

From the time of Alaric's ravages in the Grecian provinces, until the accession of Justinian, the government of the Eastern Empire assumed more and more that administrative character

[1] *Cod. Theodos.* xv. 5, 5; x. viii. 5; xi. l. 33.
[2] Philostorgius, ix. 8. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, v. 101. Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv. 6; xxviii. 5) indicates the depopulation of the empire.

which it retained until the united forces of the Crusaders and Venetians destroyed it in the year 1204. A feeling that the interests of the emperor and his subjects were identical, began to become prevalent throughout the Greek population. This feeling was greatly strengthened by the attention which the government paid to improving the civil condition of its subjects. The judicial and financial administration received, during this period, a greater degree of power, as well as a more bureaucratic organisation; and the whole strength of the government no longer reposed on the military establishments. Rebellions of the army became of rarer occurrence, and usually originated in civil intrigues, or the discontent of unrewarded mercenaries. A slight glance at the history of the Eastern Empire is sufficient to show that the court of Constantinople possessed a degree of authority over its most powerful officers, and a direct connection with its distant provinces, which had not previously existed in the Roman empire.

Still the successful resistance which the Eastern Empire offered to the establishment of the northern nations within its limits, must be attributed to the density of the native population, to the number of the walled towns, and to its geographical configuration, rather than to the spirit of the Greeks, to the military force of the legions, or to any general measures of improvement adopted by the imperial government. Even where most successful, it was a passive rather than an active resistance. The sea which separated the European and Asiatic provinces opposed physical difficulties to invaders, while it afforded great facilities for defence, retreat, and renewed attack to the Roman forces, as long as they could maintain a naval superiority. These circumstances unfortunately increased the power of the central administration to oppress the people, as well as to defend them against foreign invaders, and allowed the emperors to persist in the system of fiscal rapacity which constantly threatened to annihilate a large portion of the wealth from which a considerable mass of the citizens derived their subsistence. At the very moment when the evils of the system became so apparent as to hold out some hope of reform, the fiscal exigencies of the government were increased by money becoming an important element in war, since it was necessary to hire armies as well as to provide facilities of transport, and means of concentration, in cases of danger, defeat, or victory;

so that it began to be a financial calculation in many cases, whether it was more prudent to defend or to ransom a province. The great distance of the various frontiers, though it increased the difficulty of preventing every hostile incursion, hindered any rebellious general from uniting under his command the whole forces of the empire. The control which the government was thus enabled to exercise over all its military officers, secured a regular system of discipline, by centralising the services of equipping, provisioning, and paying the soldiers; and the direct connection between the troops and the government could no longer be counteracted by the personal influence which a general might acquire, in consequence of a victorious campaign. The power of the emperors over the army, and the complete separation which existed in the social condition of the citizen and the soldier, rendered any popular movement in favour of reform hopeless. A successful rebellion could only have created a new military power, it could not have united the interests of the military with those of the people, unless changes had been effected which were too great to be attempted by any individual legislator, and too extensive to be accomplished during one generation. The subjects of the empire were also composed of so many nations, differing in language, usages, and civilisation, that unity of measures on the part of the people was impossible, while no single province could expect to obtain redress of its own grievances by an appeal to arms.

The age was one of war and conquest; yet, with all the aspirations and passions of a despotic and military State, the Eastern Empire was, by its financial position, compelled to act on the defensive, and to devote all its attention to rendering the military subordinate to the civil power, in order to save the empire from being eaten up by its own defenders. Its measures were at last successful; the northern invaders were repulsed, the army was rendered obedient, and the Greek nation was saved from the fate of the Romans. The army became gradually attached to the source of pay and honour: and it was rather from a general feature of all despotic governments, than from any peculiarity in the Eastern Empire, that the soldiery frequently appear devoted to the imperial power, but perfectly indifferent to the person of the emperor. The condition of the Western Empire requires to be contrasted with that of the Eastern, in order to appreciate the danger of the crisis through which favourable circumstances, and some

prudence, carried the government of Constantinople. Yet, even in the West, in spite of all the disorganisation of the government, the empire suffered more from the misconduct of the Roman officers than from the strength of its assailants. Even Genseric could hardly have penetrated into Africa unless he had been invited by Boniface, and assisted by his rebellion; while the imperial officers in Britain, Gaul, and Spain, who, towards the end of the reign of Honorius, assumed the imperial title, laid those provinces open to the incursions of the barbarians. The government of the Western Empire was really destroyed, the frame of political society was broken in pieces, and the provinces depopulated, some time before its final conquest had been achieved by foreigners. The Roman principle of aristocratic rule was unable to supply that bond of union which the national organisation of the Greeks, aided by the influence of the established church, furnished in the East.

It has been already observed that the geographical features of the Eastern Empire exercised an important influence on its fate. Both in Europe and Asia extensive provinces are bounded or divided by chains of mountains which terminate on the shores of the Adriatic, the Black Sea, or the Mediterranean. These mountain-ranges compel all invaders to advance by certain well-known roads and passes, along which the means of subsistence for large armies can only be collected by foresight and prudent arrangements. The ordinary communication by land between neighbouring provinces is frequently tedious and difficult; and the inhabitants of many mountain districts retained their national character, institutions, and language, almost unaltered during the whole period of the Roman sway. In these provinces the population was active in resisting every foreign invader; and the conviction that their mountains afforded them an impregnable fortress insured the success of their efforts. Thus the feelings and prejudices of the portion of the inhabitants of the empire which had been long opposed to the Roman government, now operated powerfully to support the imperial administration. These circumstances, and some others which acquired strength as the general civilisation of the empire declined, concurred to augment the importance of the native population existing in the different provinces of the Eastern Empire, and prevented the Greeks from acquiring a moral, as well as a political, ascendancy in the distant provinces. In Europe, the Thracians

distinguished themselves by their hardihood and military propensities. In Asia, the Pamphylians, having obtained arms to defend themselves against the brigands who began to infest the provinces in large bands, employed them with success in opposing the Goths.[1] The Isaurians, who had always retained possession of their arms, began to occupy a place in the history of the empire, which they acquired by their independent spirit and warlike character. The Armenians, the Syrians, and the Egyptians, all began to engage in a rivalry with the Greeks, and even contested their superiority in literary and ecclesiastical knowledge. These circumstances exercised considerable influence in preventing the court of Constantinople from identifying itself with the Greek people, and enabled the Eastern emperors to cling to the maxims and pride of ancient Rome as the ground of their sovereignty over so many various races of mankind.

The wealth of the Eastern Empire was a principal means of its defence against the barbarians. While it invited their invasions, it furnished the means of repulsing their attacks or of bribing their forbearance. It was usefully employed in securing the retreat of those bodies who, after having broken through the Roman lines of defence, found themselves unable to seize any fortified post, or to extend the circle of their ravages. Rather than run the risk of engaging with the Roman troops, by delaying their march for the purpose of plundering the open country, they were often content to retire without ravaging the district, on receiving a sum of money and a supply of provisions. These sums were generally so inconsiderable, that it would have been the height of folly in the government to refuse to pay them, and thus expose its subjects to ruin and slavery; but as it was evident that the success of the barbarians would invite new invasions, it is surprising that the imperial administration should not have taken better measures to place the inhabitants of the exposed districts in a condition to defend themselves, and thus secure the treasury against a repetition of this ignominious expenditure. But the jealousy with which the Roman government regarded its own subjects was the natural consequence of the oppression with which it ruled them. No danger seemed so great as that of intrusting the Greek population with arms.

The commerce of the Eastern Empire, and the gold and silver mines of Thrace and Pontus, still furnished abundant

[1] Zosimus, v. 15, 16, p. 265, edit. Bonn.

supplies of the precious metals. We know that the mint of Constantinople was always rich in gold, for its gold coinage circulated through western and northern Europe for several centuries after the destruction of the Western Empire. The proportion in the value of gold to silver, which in the time of Herodotus was as one to thirteen, was, after a lapse of eight centuries, in the time of Arcadius and Honorius, as one to fourteen and two-fifths.[1] The commerce of Constantinople embraced, at this time, almost the trade of the world. The manufactories of the East supplied western Europe with many articles of daily use, and the merchants carried an extensive transport trade with central Asia. By means of the Red Sea, the productions of southern Africa and India were collected and distributed among numerous nations who inhabited the shores within and without the Straits of Babelmandeb—countries which were then far richer, more populous, and in a much higher state of civilisation than at present. The precious metals, which were becoming rare in Europe, from the stagnation of trade, and the circumscribed exchanges which take place in a rude society, were still kept in active circulation by the various wants of the merchants who brought their commodities from far distant lands. The island of Jotaba, which was a free city in the Red Sea, became a mercantile position of great importance; and from the title of the collectors of the imperial customs which were exacted in its port, the Eastern emperors must have levied a duty of ten per cent on all the merchandise destined for the Roman empire.[2] This island was occupied by the Arabs for some time, but returned under the power of the Eastern Empire during the reign of Anastasius.[3]

As the Eastern Empire generally maintained a decided naval superiority over its enemies, the commerce of the empire seldom suffered any serious interruption. The pirates who infested the Hellespont about the year 438, and the Vandals under Genseric who ravaged the coasts of Greece in 466 and 475, were more dreaded by the people on account of their cruelty than by the government or the merchants in consequence of their success, which was never great.[4] In the general disorder which reigned over the whole of western

1 Herodotus, iii. 95. *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 2, 1. A.D. 397.
2 Malchi, *Hist.* p. 232, edit. Bonn. Δεκατηλόγοι.
3 Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 121, edit. Paris.
4 Procopius, *De Bello Vand.* 1, 5. Malchus, p. 260, edit. Bonn. Clinton's *Fasti Romani.*

Europe, the only depots for merchandise that could be formed in security were in the Eastern Empire. The emperors saw the importance of this commercial influence, and made considerable exertions to support the naval superiority of the empire. Theodosius II. assembled a fleet of eleven hundred transports when he proposed to attack the Vandals in Africa.[1] The armament of Leo the Great, for the same purpose, was on a still larger scale, and formed one of the greatest naval forces ever assembled by the Roman power.[2]

Section X

Declining condition of the Greek population in the European provinces of the Eastern Empire

The ravages inflicted by the northern nations on the frontier provinces, during the century which elapsed from the defeat of Valens to the immigration of the Ostrogoths into Italy, were so continual that the agricultural population was almost destroyed in the countries immediately to the south of the Danube, and the inhabitants of Thrace and Macedonia were greatly diminished in number, and began to lose the use of their ancient languages from their admixture with foreign races. The declining trade caused by decreased consumption, poverty, and insecurity of property, also lowered the scale of civilisation among the whole Greek people. One tribe of barbarians followed another, as long as anything was left to plunder. The Huns, under Attila, laid waste the provinces to the south of the Danube for about five years, and were only induced to retreat, on receiving from the emperor six thousand pounds of gold, and the promise of an annual payment of two thousand.[3] The Ostrogoths, after obtaining an establishment to the south of the Danube, as allies of the empire, and receiving an annual subsidy from the Emperor Marcian to guard the frontiers, availed themselves of every pretext to plunder Mœsia, Macedonia, Thrace, and Thessaly. Their king, Theodoric, proved by far the most dangerous enemy that the Eastern Empire had yet encountered. Educated at the court of Constantinople as a hostage, his ten years' residence enabled him to acquire a complete knowledge of the languages, the politics, and the

[1] A.D. 441. Theophanes, *Chron.* 87.
[2] A.D. 468. See below, page 183.
[3] A.D. 442 to 447. Equal to £288,000 and £96,000.

administration of the imperial government.[1] Though he inherited an independent sovereignty over the Goths in Pannonia, he found that country so exhausted by the oppression of his countrymen, and by the ravages of other barbarians, that the whole nation of the Ostrogoths was compelled to emigrate, and Theodoric became a military adventurer in the Roman service, and acted as an ally, a mercenary, or an enemy, according as circumstances appeared to render the assumption of these different characters most conducive to his own aggrandisement.

It would throw little additional light on the state of the Greeks, to trace minutely the records of Theodoric's quarrels with the imperial court, or to narrate, in detail, the ravages committed by him, or by another Gothic mercenary of the same name, in the provinces, from the shores of the Black Sea to those of the Adriatic. These plundering expeditions were not finally terminated until Theodoric quitted the Eastern Empire to conquer Italy, and found the Ostrogothic monarchy, by which he obtained the title of the Great.[2]

It was certainly no imaginary feeling of respect which prevented Alaric, Genseric, Attila, and Theodoric, from attempting the conquest of Constantinople. If they had thought the task as easy as the subjugation of Rome, there can be no doubt that the Eastern Empire would have been as fiercely assailed as the Western, and new Rome would have shared the fate of the world's ancient mistress. These warriors could only have been restrained by the great difficulties which the undertaking presented, and by the conviction that they would meet with a far more determined resistance on the part of the inhabitants, than the corrupt condition of the imperial court, and the disordered state of the public administration, appeared at first sight to promise. Their experience in civil and military affairs revealed to them the existence of an inherent strength in the population of the Eastern Empire, and a multiplicity of resources which their attacks might call into action but could not overcome. Casual encounters often showed that the people were neither destitute of courage nor military spirit, when circumstances favoured their display. Attila himself, the terror both of Goths and Romans—the Scourge of God—was defeated before the town of Asemous, a frontier fortress of Illyria. Though he regarded its conquest as a matter of the greatest importance to his plans, the

[1] A.D. 461 to 471. [2] A.D. 489.

inhabitants baffled all his attempts, and set his power at defiance.[1] Generic was defeated by the inhabitants of the little town of Tænarus in Laconia.[2] Theodoric did not venture to attack Thessalonica, even at a time when the inhabitants, enraged at the neglect of the imperial government, drove out the officers of the emperor, overthrew his statues, and prepared to defend themselves against the barbarians with their own unassisted resources.[3] There is another remarkable example of the independent spirit of the Greek people, which saved their property from ruin, in the case of Heraclea, a city of Macedonia. The inhabitants, in the moment of danger, placed their bishop at the head of the civil government, and intrusted him with power to treat with Theodoric, who, on observing their preparations for defence, felt satisfied that it would be wiser to retire on receiving a supply of provisions for his army, than venture on plundering the country. Many other instances might be adduced to prove that the hordes of the northern barbarians were in reality not sufficiently numerous to overcome a determined resistance on the part of the Greek nation, and that the principal cause of their success within the Roman territories was the vicious nature of the Roman government.

Theodoric succeeded, during the year 479, in surprising Epidamnus by treachery; and the alarm which this conquest caused at the court of Constantinople shows that the government was not blind to the importance of preventing any foreign power from acquiring a permanent dominion over a Greek city. The emperor Zeno offered to cede to the Goths the extensive province of Dardania, which was then almost destitute of inhabitants, in order to induce Theodoric to quit Epidamnus. That city, the emperor declared, constituted a part of the well-peopled provinces of the empire, and it was therefore in vain for Theodoric to expect that he could keep possession of it.[4] This remarkable observation shows that the desolation of the northern provinces was now beginning to compel the government of the Eastern Empire to regard the countries inhabited by the Greeks, which were still comparatively populous, as forming the national territory of the Roman empire in Europe.

[1] Priscus, p. 143, edit. Bonn. Gibbon considers this to be the same place whose privilege of maintaining a native garrison is mentioned by Theophylactus, vii. c. 3. Gibbon, c. xlvi. note 36.

[2] Procopius, *De Bello Vand.* i. 22.

[3] Malchus, 255, edit. Bonn.

[4] Malchus, 254, edit. Bonn.

Section XI

Improvement in the Eastern Empire, from the Death of Arcadius to the Accession of Justinian

From the death of Arcadius to the accession of Justinian, during a period of one hundred and twenty years,[1] the empire of the East was governed by six sovereigns of very different characters, whose reigns have been generally viewed through the medium of religious prejudices; yet, in spite of the dissimilarity of their personal conduct, the general policy of their government is characterised by strong features of resemblance. The power of the emperor was never more unlimited, but it was never more systematically exercised. The administration of the empire, and of the imperial household, were equally regarded as a part of the sovereign's private estate, while the lives and fortunes of his subjects were considered as a portion of the property of which he was the master.[2] The absolute power of the emperor was now controlled by the danger of foreign invasions, and by the power of the church. The oppressed could seek refuge with the barbarians, and the persecuted might find the means of opposing the government by the power of the orthodox clergy, who were strong in the support of a great part of the population. The fear of divisions in the Church itself, which was now intimately connected with the State, served also in some degree as a restraint on the arbitrary conduct of the emperor. The interest of the sovereign became thus identified with the sympathies of the majority of his subjects; yet the difficulty of deciding what policy the emperor ought to follow in the ecclesiastical disputes of the heretics and the orthodox, was so great, as at times to give an appearance of doubt and indecision to the religious opinions of several emperors.

The decline of the Roman power had created an eager desire to remedy the disorders which had brought the empire to the brink of destruction. Most of the provinces of the West were inhabited by mixed races without union; the power of the military commanders was beyond the control of public opinion; and neither the emperor, the senate, nor the higher clergy, were directly connected with the body of the people.

1 A.D. 408 to 527.

2 *Cod. Theod.* ix. 14, 3—"Nam et ipsi pars corporis nostri sunt." *Cod. Just.* ix. 8, 5.

In the East, the opinion of the people possessed some authority, and it was consequently studied and treated with greater deference. The importance of enforcing the impartial administration of justice was so deeply felt by the government, that the emperors themselves attempted to restrict the application of their legislative power in individual and isolated cases. At a later period the Emperor Anastasius ordered the judges to pay no attention to any private rescript, if it should be found contrary to the received laws of the empire, or to the public good; in such cases he commanded the judges to follow the established laws.[1] The senate of Constantinople possessed great authority in controlling the general administration, and the dependent position of its members prevented that authority from being regarded with jealousy. The permanent existence of this body enabled it to establish fixed maxims of policy, and to render these maxims the grounds of the ordinary decisions of government. By this means a systematic administration was firmly consolidated, in some degree under the influence of public opinion; and its steady and permanent regulations became a powerful check on the temporary and fluctuating views of the sovereign.

Theodosius II. succeeded his father Arcadius at the age of eight; and he governed the empire for forty-two years, during which he left the care of the public administration very much in the hands of others. His sister Pulcheria, though only two years older than her brother, exercised great influence over his education; and she seems, in all her actions, to have been guided by sentiments of philanthropy as well as piety. She taught him to perform the ceremonial portion of his imperial duties with grace and dignity, but she could not teach him, perhaps he was incapable of learning, how to act and think as became a Roman emperor. At the age of fifteen Pulcheria received the rank of Augusta, and assumed the direction of public affairs for her brother. Theodosius was naturally mild, humane, and devout. Though he possessed some manly personal accomplishments, his mind and character were deficient in strength. He cultivated the arts of writing and painting with such success as to render his skill in the illumination of manuscripts his most remarkable personal distinction. His Greek subjects, mingling kindness with contempt, bestowed on him the name of Kalligraphos. His incapacity for business was so great, that he is hardly accused of

[1] *Cod. Just.* i. 22, 6.

having augmented the misfortunes of his reign by his own acts. A spirit of reform, and a desire of improvement, had penetrated into the imperial administration; and his reign was distinguished by many internal changes for the better. Among these, the publication of the Theodosian code, and the establishment of the university of Constantinople, were the most important. The Theodosian code afforded the people the means of arraigning the conduct of their rulers before fixed principles of law, and the university of Constantinople established the influence of Greek literature, and gave the Greek language an official position in the Eastern Empire.[1] The reign of Theodosius was also distinguished by two great remissions of arrears of taxation. By these concessions the greatest possible boon was conferred on the people, for they extinguished all claim for unpaid taxation over a period of sixty years.[2] The weakness of the emperor, by throwing the direction of public business into the hands of the senate and the ministers, for a long period consolidated that systematic administration which characterises the government of his successors. He was the first of the emperors who was more a Greek than a Roman in his feelings and tastes; but his inactivity prevented his private character from exercising much influence on his public administration.

In the long series of eight centuries which elapsed from the final establishment of the Eastern Empire, at the accession of Arcadius, to its destruction by the Crusaders, no Athenian citizen gained a place of honour in the annals of the empire. The schools of Athens were fruitful in pedants, but they failed to produce true men. In ancient times, it was observed that those who were trained as athletes were not distinguished as soldiers; and modern times confirm the testimony afforded by the history of the Eastern Empire, that professors of universities, and teachers even of political philosophy, make bad statesmen. But though the men of Athens had degenerated into literary triflers, the women upheld the fame of the city of Minerva. Two Athenian beauties, Eudocia and Irene, are among the most celebrated empresses who occupied the throne of Constantinople. The eventful life of Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius II., does not require to borrow romantic incidents from Eastern tales; it only asks for genius in the

1 *Cod. Theod.* xiv. 9, 3. *Cod. Just.* xi. 18, 1. See *infra*, p. 194.
2 The first remission was in 414, for forty years ending in 408. The second in 443, for twenty years ending in 428. *Cod. Theod.* xi. 28, 9, 16, 17.

narrator to unfold a rich web of romance. Some circumstances in her history deserve notice, even in this volume, as they throw light incidentally on the state of society among the Greeks.

The beautiful Eudocia was the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, Leontios, who still sacrificed to the heathen divinities. Her heathen name was Athenais. She received a classical education, while she acquired the elegant accomplishments of that aristocratic society which had cultivated the amenities of life from the time of Plato, who made use of carpets in his rooms, and allowed ladies to attend his lectures.[1] Her extraordinary talents induced her father to give her a careful literary and philosophical education. All her teachers were gratified with her progress. Her native accent charmed the inhabitants of Constantinople, accustomed to pure Attic Greek by the eloquence of Chrysostom; and she also spoke Latin with the graceful dignity of a Roman lady. The only proof of rustic simplicity which her biography enables us to trace in Athenian manners, is the fact that her father, who was a man of wealth as well as a philosopher, believed that her beauty, virtue, and accomplishments, would obtain her a suitable marriage without any dowry. He left his whole fortune to his son, and the consequence was that the beautiful Athenais, unable to find a husband among the provincial nobles who visited Athens, was compelled to try her fortune at the court of Constantinople, under the patronage of Pulcheria, in the semi-menial position which we now term a maid of honour. Pulcheria was then only fifteen years old, and Eudocia was probably twenty.[2] The young Augusta was soon gratified by the conversion of her beautiful heathen protegée to Christianity; but time passed on, and the courtiers of Constantinople showed no better taste in matrimony than the provincial decurions. The dowerless Eudocia remained unmarried, until Pulcheria persuaded her docile brother to fall in love with the fair Athenian. At the ripe age of twenty-seven, she became the wife of Theodosius II., who was twenty, and the pagans might then boast that Leontios had acted as a seer, not as a pedant, in leaving her without a dowry.

Twenty years after her marriage, Eudocia was accused of a

[1] Diogenes Laertius. Diogenes, vi. 2, 26. Plato, iii. xxxi. sect. 46.

[2] A.D. 414. Eudocia was married in 421, became Augusta in 423, and was exiled to Jerusalem in 444.—Clinton, *Fasti Romani*; Tables and Appendix, p. 136.

criminal passion for Paulinos, a handsome officer of the court. At the age of fifty the blood is usually tame, and waits upon the judgment. We are also led to suppose that Paulinos, whom one of the chroniclers tells us Eudocia loved because he was very learned and very handsome, had also fallen into the sere and yellow leaf, for the unlawful attachment of the empress was revealed by his being laid up with the gout. The story runs thus. As the emperor Theodosius was going to church on the feast of Epiphany, a poor man presented him with a Phrygian apple of extraordinary size. The emperor and all the senate stopped and admired the monstrous apple, and Theodosius made his treasurer pay the poor man 150 gold byzants. The apple was sent immediately to Eudocia, who lost no time in forwarding it to the constant object of her thoughts, the gouty Paulinos. He, with less of devoted affection than might have been expected considering the rank and circumstances of the donor, despatched it as a present to the emperor, who, on his return from church, found his costly Phrygian apple ready to welcome him a second time. Theodosius not being satisfied with the manner in which his wife had treated his present, asked her what she had done with it; and Eudocia, whose fifty years had not diminished her appetite for fruit in a forenoon, replied with delightful simplicity, that she had eaten the monster. This falsehood awakened green-eyed jealousy in the heart of Theodosius. Perhaps the Kalligraphos, on his way home from church, had contemplated adorning the initial letter of a manuscript with a miniature of Eudocia holding the enormous apple in her hand. A scene of course followed; the apple was produced; the emperor was eloquent in his reproaches, the empress equally eloquent in her tears, as may be found better expressed in similar cases in modern novels than in ancient histories. The result was that the handsome man with the gout was banished, and shortly after put to death. The empress was sent into exile with becoming pomp, under the pretext of making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where she displayed her learning by paraphrasing several portions of Scripture in heroic verses. Gibbon very justly observes that this celebrated story of the apple is fit only for the Arabian Nights, where something not very unlike it may be found. His opinion is doubly valuable, from the disposition he generally shows to credit similar tales of scandal, as in the case of the secret history of Procopius, to which he ascribes more authority than

it deserves.[1] Eudocia on her death-bed declared that the reports of her criminal attachment to Paulinos were false. They must have been very prevalent, or she would not have considered it necessary to give them this solemn denial. Her death is placed in the year 460.

Marcian, a Thracian of humble birth, who had risen from a common soldier to the rank of senator, and had already attained the age of fifty-eight, was selected by Pulcheria as the man most worthy to fill the imperial throne on the death of her brother.[2] He received the rank of her husband merely to secure his title to the empire. She had taken monastic vows at an early age, though she continued to bear, during her brother's reign, a considerable part in the conduct of public business, having generally acted as his counsellor.[3] The conduct of Marcian, after he became emperor, justified Pulcheria's choice; and it is probable that he was one of the senators who had supported the systematic policy by which Pulcheria endeavoured to restore the strength of the empire; a policy which sought to limit the arbitrary exercise of the despotic power of the emperor by fixed institutions, well-regulated forms of procedure, and an educated and organised body of civil officials. Marcian was a soldier who loved peace without fearing war. One of his first acts was to refuse payment of the tribute which Attila had exacted from Theodosius. His reign lasted six years and a half, and was chiefly employed in restoring the resources of the empire, and alleviating its burdens. In the theological disputes which divided his subjects, Marcian attempted to act with impartiality; and he assembled the council of Chalcedon in the vain hope of establishing a system of ecclesiastical doctrine common to the whole empire. His attempt to identify the Christian church with the Roman empire only widened the separation of the different sects of Christians; and the opinions of the dissenters, while they were regarded as heretical, began to be adopted as national. Religious communities began everywhere to assume a national character. The Eutychian heresy became the

[1] The story is found in the *Chronicon Paschale*, 316; Theophanes, 85; Zonaras and Cedrenus; Gibbon, chap. xxxii. note 77, vol. iv. p. 165. The story of the three apples is probably an imitation of this Greek original. It is remarkable for the true picture it gives of the character of Haroun.

[2] Marcian had been taken prisoner by Genseric when he accompanied Aspar with an army to support Boniface.—Procopius, *De Bello Vand.* lib. i.

[3] It is singular to find hereditary rights and celibacy growing up together. During the fifth century, it was by no means unusual to take vows, and continue to bear an active part in public business.

religion of Egypt; Nestorianism was that of Mesopotamia. In such a state of things Marcian sought to temporise from feelings of humanity, and bigots made this spirit of toleration a reproach.

Leo the Elder, another Thracian, was elected emperor, on the death of Marcian, by the influence of Aspar, a general of barbarian descent, who had acquired an authority similar to that which Stilicho and Ætius had possessed in the West. Aspar being a foreigner and an Arian, durst not himself, notwithstanding his influence and favour with the army, aspire to the imperial throne; a fact which proves that the political constitution of the government, and the fear of public opinion, exercised some control over the despotic power of the court of Constantinople. The insolence of Aspar and his family determined Leo to diminish the authority of the barbarian leaders in the imperial service; and he adopted measures for recruiting the army from his native subjects. The system of his predecessors had been to place more reliance on foreigners than on natives; to employ mercenary strangers as their guards, and to form the best armed and highest paid corps entirely of barbarians. In consequence of the neglect with which the native recruits had been treated, they had fallen into such contempt that they were ranked in the legislation of the empire as an inferior class of military.[1] Leo could not reform the army, without removing Aspar; and, despairing of success by any other means, he employed assassination; thus casting, by the murder of his benefactor, so deep a stain on his own character that he acquired the surname of the Butcher. During his reign, the arms of the empire were generally unsuccessful; and his great expedition against Genseric, the most powerful and expensive naval enterprise which the Romans had ever prepared, was completely defeated.[2] As it was dangerous to confide so mighty a force to any general of talent, Basilicus, the brother of the empress, was intrusted with the chief command. His incapacity assisted the Vandals in defeating the expedition quite as much as the prudence and talents of Genseric. The Ostrogoths, in the mean time, extended their

1 *Cod. Theodos.*

2 Theophanes, *Chron.* 99. Gibbon, iv. 284. The fleet consisted of 1113 ships; the army and navy included 100,000 men. Gibbon estimates the expense of this expedition at a sum equal to £5,200,000 sterling, and Lydus (*De Magist.* iii. 43) confirms this estimate by stating that the expenditure amounted to 65,000 lb. of gold, and 700,000 lb. of silver. Compare Suidas, χειρίρω and *C. Scrip. Hist. Byz. excerpta e Menandri Historia*, edit. Niebuhr, p. 427.

ravages from the Danube as far as Thessaly, and there appeared some probability that they would succeed in establishing a permanent kingdom in Illyria and Macedonia, completely independent of the imperial power. The civil administration of Leo was conducted with great prudence. He followed in the steps of his predecessor in all his attempts to lighten the burdens of his subjects, and to improve their condition. When Antioch suffered severely from an earthquake, he remitted the public taxes to the amount of one thousand pounds of gold, and granted freedom from all imposts to those who rebuilt their ruined houses. In the disputes which still divided the church, he adopted the orthodox or Greek party, in opposition to the Eutychians and Nestorians. The epithet of Great has been bestowed on him by the Greeks—a title, it should seem, conferred upon him rather with reference to his being the first of his name, and on account of his orthodoxy, than from the pre-eminence of his personal actions.[1] He died at the age of sixty-three, and was succeeded by his grandson, Leo II., an infant, who survived his elevation only a few months, A.D. 474.

Zeno mounted the throne on the death of his son, Leo II. He was an Isaurian, whom Leo the Great had selected as the husband of his daughter Ariadne, when he was engaged in rousing the military spirit of his own subjects against the barbarian mercenaries. In the eyes of the Greeks, the Isaurians were little better than barbarians; but their valour had obtained for them a high reputation among the troops in the capital. The origin of Zeno rendered him unpopular with the Greeks; and as he did not participate in their nationality in religion, any more than in descent, he was accused of cherishing heretical opinions. He appears to have been unsteady in his views, and vicious in his conduct; yet the difficulties of his position were so great, and the prejudices against him so strong, that in spite of all the misfortunes of his reign, the fact of his having maintained the integrity of the Eastern Empire attests that he could not have been totally deficient in courage and talent. The year after he ascended the throne, he was driven from Constantinople by Basiliskos, the brother of Leo's widow Verina; but Basiliskos could only keep possession of the capital for about twenty months, and Zeno recovered his

[1] Leo was the author of the earliest law condemning to death converts to Christianity who relapsed to paganism. The Othoman Turks have only copied the bigotry of their Christian predecessors at Constantinople.—*Cod. Just.* i. xi. 10.

authority. The great work of his reign, which lasted seventeen years and a half, was the formation of an army of native troops to serve as a counterpoise to the barbarian mercenaries who threatened the Eastern Empire with the same fate as the Western. About the commencement of his reign he witnessed the final extinction of the Western Empire, and, for many years, the Theodorics threatened him with the loss of the greater part of the European provinces of the Eastern. Surely the man who successfully resisted the schemes and the forces of the great Theodoric could not have been a contemptible emperor, even though his orthodoxy were questionable. When it is remembered, therefore, that Zeno was an Isaurian, and a peacemaker in theological quarrels, it will not be surprising that the Greeks, who regarded him as a heterodox barbarian, should have heaped many calumnies on his memory. From his laws which have been preserved in the code of Justinian, he seems to have adopted judicious measures for alleviating the fiscal obligations of the landed proprietors, and his prudence was shown by his not proposing to the senate the adoption of his brother as his successor. The times were difficult; his brother was worthless, and the support of the official aristocracy was necessary. The disposal of the imperial crown was again placed in the hands of Ariadne.

Anastasius secured his election by his marriage with Ariadne. He was a native of Epidamnus, and must have been near the age of sixty when he ascended the throne. In the year 514, Vitalian, general of the barbarian mercenaries, and a grandson of Aspar, assumed the title of emperor, and attempted to occupy Constantinople.[1] His principal reliance was on the bigotry of the orthodox Greeks, for Anastasius showed a disposition to favour the Eutychians. But the military power of the mercenaries had been diminished by the policy of Leo and Zeno; and it now proved insufficient to dispose of the empire, as it could derive little support from the Greeks, who were more distinguished for ecclesiastical orthodoxy than for military courage. Vitalian was defeated in his attempt on Constantinople, and consented to resign the imperial title on receiving a large sum of money, and the government of Thrace. The religious opinions of Anastasius unfortunately rendered him always unpopular, and he had to encounter some serious seditions while the empire was involved in wars with the Persians, Bulgarians, and Goths. Anastasius

[1] Gold coins of Vitalian exist.

was more afraid of internal rebellions and seditions than of defeat by foreign armies; and he sub-divided the command of his troops in such a way, that success in the field of battle was almost impossible. In one important campaign against Persia, the intendant-general was the officer of highest rank in an army of fifty thousand men. Military subordination, and vigorous measures, under such an arrangement, were impossible; and it reflects some credit on the organisation of the Roman troops, that they were enabled to keep the field without total ruin.

Anastasius devoted his anxious care to alleviate the misfortunes of his subjects, and to diminish the taxes which oppressed them. He reformed the oligarchical system of the Roman curia, which had already received some modifications tending to restrict the ruinous obligation of mutual responsibility imposed on the curiales. The immediate consequences of his reforms was to increase the imperial revenue, a result which was probably effected by preventing the local aristocracy from combining with the officers of the fisc. Such changes, though they are extremely beneficial to the great body of the people, are rarely noticed with much praise by historians, who generally write under the influence of central prejudices.[1] He constructed the great wall, to secure from destruction the rich villages and towns in the vicinity of Constantinople. This wall extended from the Sea of Marmora, near Selymbria, to the Black Sea, forming an arc of about forty-two miles, at a distance of twenty-eight miles from the capital.[2] The rarest virtue of a sovereign is the sacrifice of his own revenues, and, consequently, the diminution of his own power, to increase the happiness of his people. The greatest action of Anastasius was this voluntary diminution of the revenues of the State. He abolished the chrysargyron, a lucrative but oppressive tax which affected the industry of every subject. The increased prosperity which this concession infused into society soon displayed its effects; and the brilliant exploits of the reign of Justinian must be traced back to the reinvigoration of the body politic of the Roman empire by Anastasius. He expended large sums in repairing the damages caused by war and earthquakes. He constructed a canal from the lake Sophon to the Gulf of Astacus, near Nicomedia, a work which

[1] Lydus, *De Magistratibus*, iii. 49. Lydus was a conservative, and a sufferer by the reforms in the imperial administration.—Evagrius, iii. 38.
[2] Traces of this wall are still visible, about twenty feet broad.

Pliny had proposed to Trajan, and which was restored by the Byzantine emperor Alexius I.;[1] yet so exact was his economy, and so great were the revenues of the Eastern Empire, that he was enabled to accumulate, during his reign, three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of gold in the public treasury.[2] The people had prayed at his accession that he might reign as he had lived; and, even in the eyes of the Greeks, he would probably have been regarded as the model of a perfect monarch, had he not shown a disposition to favour heresy. Misled, either by his wish to comprehend all sects in the established church,—as all nations were included in the empire,—or by a too decided attachment to the doctrines of the Eutychians, he excited the opposition of the orthodox party, whose domineering spirit troubled his internal administration by several dangerous seditions, and induced the Greeks to overlook his humane and benevolent policy. He reigned more than twenty-seven years.

Justin, the successor of Anastasius, had the merit of being strictly orthodox. He was a Thracian peasant from Tauresium, in Dardania, who entered the imperial guard as a common soldier. At the age of sixty-eight, when Anastasius died, he had attained the rank of commander-in-chief of the imperial guards, and a seat in the senate. It is said that he was intrusted with a large sum of money to further a court intrigue for the purpose of placing the crown on the head of some worthless courtier. He appropriated the money to secure his own election.[3] His reign tended to unite more closely the church with the imperial authority, and to render the opposition of the heterodox more national in the various provinces where a national clergy and a national language existed. Justin was without education, but he possessed experience and talents. In his civil government he imitated the wise and economical policy of his predecessor, and his military experience enabled him to improve the condition of the army. He furnished large sums to alleviate the misery caused by a terrible earthquake at Antioch, and paid great attention to

[1] Anna Comnena, 282, edit. Par. Pliny, *Ep.* x. 50. Ainsworth's *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, i. 26. The importance of this work has induced several Othoman Sultans to discuss projects for its restoration. An inscription, copied by Chandler, at Megara, informs us that its fortifications were repaired by Count Diogenes, an officer of Anastasius who had distinguished himself in the Isaurian rebellion.—Chandler's *Travels*, c. 43. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, ii. 390.

[2] £13,000,000. Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* 19. Gibbon, vii. 109.

[3] Constantine I. had established Sclavonian colonies in Thrace (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv. 6); but Justin was perhaps of the old Thracian stock, then beginning to undergo the modifications which ultimately transformed it into the Vallachian race.

repairing the public buildings throughout the empire. His reign lasted nine years, A.D. 518–527.

It must be observed that the five emperors of whose character and policy the preceding sketch has described the prominent features, were men born in the middle or lower ranks of society; and all of them, with the exception of Zeno, had witnessed, as private individuals, the ravages of the barbarians in their native provinces, and suffered personally from the weak and disorganised state of the empire. They had all ascended the throne at a mature age, and these coincidences tended to imprint on their councils that unformity of policy which marks their history. They had all more of the feelings of the people than of the dominant class, and were, consequently, more subjects than Romans. They appear to have participated in popular sympathies to a degree natural only to men who had long lived without courtly honours, and rare, indeed, even among those of the greatest genius, who are born or educated near the steps of a throne. That some part of the merit of these sovereigns was commonly ascribed to the experience which they had gained by a long life, is evident from the reply which, it is said, the Emperor Justin gave to the senators, who wished him to raise Justinian, at the age of forty, to the dignity of Augustus: "You should pray," said the prudent monarch, "that a young man may never wear the imperial robes."[1]

During this eventful period, the Western Empire crumbled into ruins, while the Eastern was saved, in consequence of these emperors having organised the system of administration which has been most unjustly calumniated, under the name of Byzantine. The highest officers, and the proudest military commanders, were rendered completely dependent on ministerial departments, and were no longer able to conspire or rebel with impunity. The sovereign was no longer exposed to personal danger, nor the treasury to open peculation. But, unfortunately, the central executive power could not protect the people from fraud with the same ease as it guarded the treasury; and the emperors never perceived the necessity of intrusting the people with the power of defending themselves from the financial oppression of the subaltern administration.

The principles of political science and civil liberty were, indeed, very little understood by the people of the Roman

[1] Gibbon considers this a sneer at the senators who had sold their votes to Justinian. —v. 39. - Zonaras, ii. 60, edit. Par.

mpire. The legislative, executive, and administrative powers of government were confounded, as well as concentrated, in the person of the sovereign. The emperor represented the sovereignty of Rome, which, even after the establishment of Christianity, was considered as something superhuman, if not precisely a divine institution. But, so ill can despotism balance the various powers of the State, and so incapable is it of studying the condition of the governed, that even under the best emperors, seditions and rebellions were not rare. They constituted the only means whereby the people could make their petitions heard; and the moment the populace ceased to be overawed by military force, every trifling discontent might, from accident, break out into a rebellion. The continual abuse to which arbitrary power is liable was felt by the emperors; and several of them attempted to restrain its exercise, in order that the general principles of legislation might not be violated by the imperial ordinances. Such laws express the sentiments of justice which animate the administration, but they are always useless; for no law can be of any avail unless a right to enforce its observance exist in some tribunal, independent of the legislative and executive powers of the State; and the very existence of such a tribunal implies that the State possesses a constitution which renders the law more powerful than the prince. Much, however, as many of the Roman emperors may have loved justice, no one was ever found who felt inclined to diminish his own authority so far as to render the law permanently superior to his own will. Yet a strong impulse towards improvement was felt throughout the empire; and, if the middle and upper classes of society had not been already so far reduced in number as to make their influence almost nugatory in the scale of civilisation, there might have been some hope of the political regeneration of the Roman state. Patriotism and political honesty can, however, only become national virtues when the people possess a control over the conduct of their rulers, and when the rulers themselves publicly announce their political principles.

Erroneous views also of political economy led many of the emperors to increase the evil which they were endeavouring to remedy.[1] Had the Emperor Anastasius left the three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of gold which he accumulated in

[1] Julian caused a famine at Antioch, by fixing the price at which provisions were to be sold, and distributing four hundred thousand bushels of grain without judgment, as appears from his own account in the *Misopogon*.

the treasury circulating among his subjects, or had he employed it in works extending the industry of his people, and adding to the security of their property, it is probable that his reign would have very greatly augmented the population of the empire, and pressed back the barbarians on their own thinly peopled lands. If it had been in his power to have added to this boon some guarantee against arbitrary impositions on the part of his successors, and against the unjust exactions of the administration, there can be no doubt that his reign would have restored to the empire much of the pristine energy of the republic; and that, instead of giving a false brilliancy to the reign of Justinian, he would have increased the happiness of the most civilised portion of mankind, and given a new impulse to population.

Section XII

State of Civilisation, and Influence of National Feelings during this Period

The ravages of the Goths and Huns in Europe and Asia assisted in producing a great change in the state of society in the Eastern Empire, even though their efforts at conquest were successfully repulsed. In many provinces the higher classes were completely exterminated. The loss of their slaves and serfs, who had been carried away by the invaders, either reduced them to the condition of humble cultivators, or forced them to emigrate, and abandon their land, from which they were unable to obtain any revenue in the miserable state of cultivation to which the capture of their slaves, the destruction of their agricultural buildings, and the want of a market, had reduced the country. In many of the towns the diminished population was reduced to misery by the ruin of the district. The higher classes disappeared under the weight of the municipal duties which they were called upon to perform. Houses remained unlet; and even when let, the portion of rent which was not absorbed by the imperial taxes, was insufficient to supply the demands of the local expenditure. The labourer and the artisan alone could find bread: the walls of cities were allowed to fall into ruins: the streets were neglected; many public buildings had become useless: aqueducts remained unrepaired; internal communications ceased: and, with the extinction of the wealthy and educated classes,

he local prejudices of the lower orders became the law of ociety. Yet, on the other hand, even amidst all the evidences f decline and misery in many parts of the empire, there were ome favoured cities which afforded evidence of progress. The lives and fortunes of the lower orders, and particularly of he slaves, were much better protected than in the most lorious periods of Greek and Roman history. The police vas improved; and though luxury assisted the progress of effeminacy, it also aided the progress of civilisation by giving tability to order. The streets of the great cities of the East vere traversed with as much security during the night as by day.

The devastations of the northern invaders of the empire prepared the way for a great change in the races of mankind who dwelt in the regions between the Danube and the Mediterranean. New races were introduced from abroad, and new races were formed by the admixture of native proprietors and colons with emigrants and domestic slaves. Colonies of agricultural emigrants were introduced into every province of the empire. Several of the languages still spoken in Eastern Europe bear evidence of changes which commenced at this period. Modern Greek, Albanian, and Vallachian, are more or less the representatives of the ancient languages of Greece, Epirus, and Thrace, modified by the influence of foreign elements. In the provinces, the clergy alone were enabled to maintain a position which allowed them to devote some time to study. They accordingly became the principal depositaries of knowledge, and as their connection with the people was of the most intimate and friendly character, they employed the popular language to instruct their flocks, to preserve their attachment, and rouse their enthusiasm. In this way, ecclesiastical literature grew up in every province which possessed its own language and national character. The Scriptures were translated, read, and expounded to the people in their native dialect, in Armenian, in Syriac, in Coptic, and in Gothic, as well as in Latin and Greek. It was this connection between the people and their clergy which enabled the orthodox church, in the Eastern Empire, to preserve a popular character, in spite of the exertions of the emperors and the popes to give it a Roman or imperial organisation. Christianity, as a religion, was always universal in its character, but the Christian church long carried with it many national distinctions. The earliest church had been Jewish in its forms and

opinions, and in the East it long retained a tincture of the oriental philosophy of its Alexandrine proselytes. After Christianity became the established religion of the empire, a struggle arose between the Latin and Greek clergy for supremacy in the church. The greater learning, and the more popular character of the Greek clergy, supported by the superior knowledge and higher political importance of the laity in the East, soon gave to the Greeks a predominant influence. But this influence was still subordinate to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, who arrogated the rank of a spiritual emperor, and whose claims to represent the supremacy of Rome were admitted, though not without jealousy, by the Greeks. The authority of the Bishop of Rome, and of the Latin element in the established church, was so great in the reign of Marcian, that the legate of Pope Leo the Great, at the general council of Chalcedon, though a Greek bishop, made use of the Latin language when addressing an audience composed entirely of Eastern bishops, and for whom his discourse required to be translated into Greek. It was inconsistent with the dignity of the Roman pontiff to use any language but that of Rome, though doubtless St. Peter had made use of Greek, except when speaking with the gift of tongues. Latin, however, was the official language of the empire; and the emperor Marcian, in addressing the same council of the church, spoke that language, though he knew that Greek alone could be intelligible to the greater number of the bishops whom he addressed. It was fortunate for the Greeks, perhaps also for the whole Christian world, that the popes did not, at this time, lay claim to the gift of tongues, and address every nation in its own language. If it had occurred to them that the head of the universal church ought to speak all languages, the bishops of Rome might perhaps have rendered themselves the political sovereigns of the Christian world.

The attempt of the popes to introduce the Latin language into the East, roused the opposition of all the Greeks. The constitution of the Eastern Church still admitted the laity to a share in the election of their bishops, and obliged the members of the ecclesiastical profession to cultivate the good-will of their flocks. In the East, the language of the people was the language of religion and of ecclesiastical literature. consequently the cause of the Greek clergy and people was united. This connection with the people gave a weight and authority to the Greek clergy, which proved extremely useful

in checking the civil tyranny of the emperors and the religious despotism of the popes.

Though the emperor still maintained his supremacy over the clergy, and regarded and treated the popes and patriarchs as his ministers, still the church as a body had already rendered itself superior to the person of the emperor, and had established the principle, that the orthodoxy of the emperor was a law of the empire.[1] The Patriarch of Constantinople, suspecting the emperor Anastasius of attachment to the Eutychian heresy, refused to crown him until he gave a written declaration of his orthodoxy.[2] Yet the ceremony of the emperor's receiving the imperial crown from the Patriarch was introduced for the first time, on the accession of Leo the Great, sixty-six years before the election of Anastasius.[3] It is true that the church was not always able to enforce the observance of the principle that the empire of the East could only be governed by an orthodox sovereign. The aristocracy and the army proved at times stronger than the orthodox clergy.

The state of literature and the fine arts always affords a correct representation of the condition of society among the Greeks, though the fine arts, during the existence of the Roman empire, were more closely connected with the government and the aristocracy than with popular feelings. The assertion that Christianity tended to accelerate the decline of the Roman empire has been already refuted; but although the Eastern Empire received immeasurable benefits from Christianity, both politically and socially, still the literature and the fine arts of Greece received from it a mortal blow. The Christians soon declared themselves the enemies of all pagan literature. Homer, and the Attic tragedians, were prohibited books; and the fine arts were proscribed, if not persecuted. Many of the early fathers held opinions which were not uncongenial with the fierce contempt for letters and art entertained by the first Mohammedans. It is true that this anti-pagan spirit might have proved temporary, had it not occurred at a period when the decline of society had begun to render knowledge rarer, and learning of more difficult attainment than formerly.

1 The Theodosian Code, and particularly the sixteenth book, proves the supremacy of the civil power.

2 Eutyches taught that in Christ there was but one nature, namely, that of the Word, who became incarnate.—Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, translated by James Murdock, D.D.; edited by Soames; 4 vols., London, 1841; vol. i. 490. This excellent translation contains many valuable notes.

3 Gibbon, ch. xxxvi. note 68.

Theodosius the Younger found the administration in danger of not procuring a regular supply of well-educated aspirants to civil offices; and in order to preserve the State from such a misfortune, he established a university at Constantinople, as has been already mentioned,[1] and which was maintained at the public expense. The composition of this university demonstrates the important political position occupied by the Greek nation: fifteen professors were appointed to teach Greek, grammar, and literature; thirteen only were named to give instruction in Latin; two professors of law were added, and one of philosophy. Such was the imperial university of Theodosius, who did everything in his power to render the rank of professor highly honourable. The candidate who aspired to a chair in the university was obliged to undergo an examination before the senate, and it was necessary for him to possess an irreproachable moral character, as well as to prove that his learning was profound. The term of twenty years' service secured for the professors the title of count, and placed them among the nobility of the empire. Learning, it is evident, was still honoured and cultivated in the East; but the attention of the great body of society was directed to religious controversy, and the greatest talents were devoted to these contests. The few philosophers who kept aloof from the disputes of the Christian church, plunged into a mysticism more injurious to the human intellect, and less likely to be of any use to society, than the most furious controversy. Most of these speculators in metaphysical science abandoned all interest in the fate of their country, and in the affairs of this world, from an idle hope of being able to establish a personal intercourse with an imaginary world of spirits. With the exception of religious writings, and historical works, there was very little in the literature of this period which could be called popular. The people amused themselves with chariot races instead of the drama; and, among the higher orders, music had long taken the place of poetry. Yet the poets wanted genius, not encouragement; for John Lydus tells us that one of his poetical effusions was rewarded by the patron in whose praise it was written, with a gold byzant for each line. Pindar probably would not have expected more.[2]

The same genius which inspires poetry is necessary to excellence in the fine arts; yet, as these are more mechanical in their execution, good taste may be long retained, after inspira-

[1] Page 179. [2] Lydus, *De Magistratibus*, iii. 27, p. 219, edit. Bonn.

tion has entirely ceased, by the mere effect of imitating good models. The very constitution of society seemed to forbid the existence of genius. In order to produce the highest degree of excellence in works of literature and art, it seems absolutely necessary that the author and the public should participate in some common feelings of admiration for simplicity, beauty, and sublimity. When the condition of society places the patron of works of genius in a totally different rank of life from their authors, and renders the criticisms of a small and exclusive circle of individuals the law in literature and art, then an artificial taste must be cultivated, in order to secure the applause of those who alone possess the means of rewarding the merit of which they approve. The very fact that this taste, which the author or the artist is called upon to gratify, is to him more a task of artificial study than an effusion of natural feeling, must of itself produce a tendency to exaggeration or mannerism. There is nothing in the range of human affairs so completely democratic as taste. Demosthenes spoke to the crowd; Phidias worked for the people.

Christianity engaged in direct war with the arts. The Greeks had united painting, sculpture, and architecture, in such a way, that their temples formed a harmonious illustration of the beauties of the fine arts. The finest temples were museums of paganism, and, consequently, Christianity repudiated all connection with this class of buildings until it had disfigured and degraded them. The courts of judicature, the basilicas, not the temples, were chosen as the models of Christian churches, and the adoption of the ideal beauty of ancient sculpture was treated with contempt. The earlier Fathers of the church wished to represent our Saviour as unlike the types of the pagan divinities as possible.[1]

Works of art gradually lost their value as creations of the mind; and their destruction commenced whenever the material of which they were composed was of great value, or happened to be wanted for some other purpose more useful in the opinion of the possessor. The Theodosian Code contains many laws against the destruction of works of ancient art and the plundering of tombs.[2] The Christian religion, when it deprived the temples and the statues of a religious sanction, permitted the avaricious to destroy them in order to appropriate the materials; and, when all reverence for antiquity was effaced, it became a

[1] Milman's *History of Christianity*, ii. 353; Paris edit.
[2] *Cod. Theodos.* ix. tit. 17.

profitable, though disgraceful occupation, to ransack the pagan tombs for the ornaments which they contained. The clergy of the new religion demanded the construction of new churches; and the desecrated buildings, falling into ruins, supplied materials at less expense than the quarries.

Many of the celebrated works of art which had been transported to Constantinople at its foundation, were destroyed in the numerous conflagrations to which that city was always liable. The celebrated statues of the Muses perished in the time of Arcadius. The fashion of erecting statues had not become obsolete, though statuary and sculpture had sunk in the general decline of taste; but the vanity of the ambitious was more gratified by the costliness of the material than by the beauty of the workmanship. A silver statue of the Empress Eudocia, placed on a column of porphyry, excited so greatly the indignation of John Chrysostom, that he indulged in the most violent invectives against the empress. His virulence caused the government to exile him from the patriarchal chair. Many valuable Grecian works of bronze were melted down, in order to form a colossal statue of the Emperor Anastasius, which was placed on a lofty column to adorn the capital;[1] others, of gold and silver, were melted, and coined into money, and augmented the sums which he laid up in the public treasury. Still it is unquestionable that a taste for painting had not entirely ceased among the educated and wealthy classes. Mosaics and engraved gems were fashionable luxuries, but the general poverty had decreased the numbers of the patrons of art, and the prejudices of the Christians had greatly restricted its range.

[1] Zeno erected an equestrian statue of his ally Theodoric in the palace.—Jornandes, *De Reb. Get.* 57. The senate of Rome erected a golden statue of Theodoric.—Isidor, *Chron. Æv.* 549. Procopius describes a rude mosaic statue representing Theodoric, which soon began to fall to pieces, and was considered by the people as an emblem of the Ostrogothic monarchy. Was this not probably a Gothic imitation of a chrys-elephantine statue?—Procop. *De Bell. Goth.* i. 24.

CHAPTER III

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS UNDER THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN. A.D. 527–565

Influence of the imperial power on the condition of the Greek nation during the reign of Justinian—Military forces of the empire—Influence of Justinian's legislation on the Greek population of the empire—Internal administration, as it affected the Greek nation—Influence of Justinian's conquests on the Greek population, and the change effected by the conquest of the Vandal kingdom of Africa—Causes of the easy conquest of the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy by Belisarius, and of the conquests in Spain—Relations of the northern nations with the Roman empire and the Greek nation—Relations with Persia—Commercial position of the Greeks, and comparison with the other nations living under the Roman government—Influence of the orthodox church on the national feelings of the Greeks—State of Athens to the extinction of its schools by Justinian.

Section I

INFLUENCE OF THE IMPERIAL POWER ON THE CONDITION OF THE GREEK NATION DURING THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN

It happens not unfrequently, that, during long periods of time, national feelings and popular institutions escape the attention of historians; their feeble traces are lost in the importance of events, apparently the effect of accident, destiny, or the special intervention of Providence. In such cases, history becomes a chronicle of facts, or a series of biographical sketches; and it ceases to yield the instructive lessons which it always affords, as long as it connects events with local habits, national customs, and the general ideas of a people. The history of the Eastern Empire often assumes this form, and is frequently little better than a mere chronicle. Its historians hardly display national character or popular feeling, and only participate in the superstition and party spirit of their situation in society. In spite of the brilliant events which have given the reign of Justinian a prominent place in the annals of mankind, it is presented to us in a series of isolated and incongruous facts. Its chief interest is derived from the biographical memorials of Belisarius, Theodora, and Justinian; and its most instructive lesson has been drawn from the influence which its

legislation has exercised on foreign nations. The unerring instinct of mankind has, however, fixed on this period as one of the greatest eras in man's annals. The actors may have been men of ordinary merit, but the events of which they were the agents effected the mightiest revolutions in society. The frame of the ancient world was broken to pieces, and men long looked back with wonder and admiration at the fragments which remained, to prove the existence of a nobler race than their own. The Eastern Empire, though too powerful to fear any external enemy, was withering away from the rapidity with which the State devoured the resources of the people; and this malady or corruption of the Roman government appeared to the wisest men of the age so utterly incurable, that it was supposed to indicate the approaching dissolution of the globe. No dawn of a new social organisation had yet manifested its advent in any part of the known world. A large portion, perhaps the majority of the human race, continued to live in a state of slavery; and slaves were still regarded as intelligent domestic animals, not as men.[1] Society was destined to be regenerated by the destruction of predial slavery; but, to destroy predial slavery, the free inhabitants of the civilised world were compelled to descend to the state of poverty and ignorance in which they had, for ages, kept the servile population. The field for general improvement could only be opened, and the reorganisation of society could only commence, when slaves and freemen were so closely intermingled in the cares and duties of life as to destroy the prejudices of class; then, at last, feelings of philanthropy were called into action by the necessities of man's condition.

The reign of Justinian is more remarkable as a portion of the history of mankind, than as a chapter in the annals of the Roman empire or of the Greek nation. The changes of centuries passed in rapid succession before the eyes of one generation. The life of Belisarius, either in its reality or its romantic form, has typified his age. In his early youth, the world was populous and wealthy, the empire rich and powerful. He conquered extensive realms and mighty nations, and led kings captive to the footstool of Justinian, the lawgiver of civilisation. Old age arrived; Belisarius sank into the grave suspected and impoverished by his feeble and ungrateful master; and the world, from the banks of the Euphrates to

[1] "Oh demens, ita servus homo est?"—Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 221.

those of the Tagus, presented the awful spectacle of famine and plague, of ruined cities, and of nations on the brink of extermination. The impression on the hearts of men was profound. Fragments of Gothic poetry, legends of Persian literature, and the fate of Belisarius himself, still indicate the eager attention with which this period was long regarded.

The expectation that Justinian would be able to re-establish the Roman power was entertained by many, and not without reasonable grounds, at the time of his accession to the throne; but, before his death, the delusion was utterly dissipated. Anastasius, by filling the treasury, and remodelling the army, had prepared the way for reforming the financial administration and improving the condition of the people. Justinian unfortunately employed the immense wealth and effective army to which he succeeded, in such a manner as to increase the burden of the imperial government, and render hopeless the future reform of the system. Yet it must still be observed that the decay of the internal resources of the empire, which proceeded with such fearful rapidity in the latter days of Justinian's reign, was interwoven with the frame of society. For six centuries, the Roman government had ruled the East in a state of tranquillity, when compared with the ordinary fortunes of the human race; and during this long period, the people had been moulded into slaves of the imperial treasury. Justinian, by introducing measures of reform tending to augment the powers and revenues of the State, only accelerated the inevitable catastrophe prepared by centuries of fiscal oppression.

It is impossible to form a correct idea of the position of the Greek population in the East, without taking a general, though cursory view of the nature of the Roman administration, and observing the effect which it produced on the whole population of the empire. The contrast presented by the increasing endeavours of the government to centralise every branch of the administration, and the additional strength which local feelings were gaining in the distant provinces, is a singular though natural consequence of the increasing wants of the sovereign, and the declining civilisation of the people. The civil organisation of the empire attained its highest degree of perfection in the reign of Justinian; the imperial power secured a practical supremacy over the military officers and beneficed clergy, and placed them under the control of the civil departments of the state; the absolute authority of

the emperor was fully established, and systematically exercised in the army, the church, and the state. A century of prudent administration had infused new vigour into the government, and Justinian succeeded to the means of rendering himself one of the greatest conquerors in the annals of the Roman empire. The change which time had effected in the position of the emperors, from the reign of Constantine to that of Justinian, was by no means inconsiderable. Two hundred years, in any government, must prove productive of great alterations.

It is true that in theory the power of the military emperor was as great as that of the civil monarch; and, according to the phrases in fashion with their contemporaries, both Constantine and Justinian were constitutional sovereigns, equally restrained, in the exercise of their power, by the laws and usages of the Roman empire.[1] But there is an essential difference between the position of a general and a king; and all the Roman emperors, until the accession of Arcadius, had been generals. The leader of an army must always, to a certain extent, be the comrade of his soldiers; he must often participate in their feelings, and make their interests and views coincide with his own. This community of sentiment generally creates so close a connection, that the wishes of the troops exercise great influence over the conduct of their leader, and moderate to them, at least, the arbitrary exercise of despotic power, by confining it within the usages of military discipline, and the habits of military life. When the civil supremacy of the Roman emperors became firmly established by the changes which were introduced into the imperial armies after the time of Theodosius the Great, the emperor ceased to be personally connected with the army, and considered himself quite as much the master of the soldiers whom he paid, as of the subjects whom he taxed. The sovereign had no longer any notion of public opinion beyond its existence in the church, and its display in the factions of the court or the amphitheatre. The immediate effects of absolute power were not, however, fully revealed in the details of the administration, until the reign of Justinian. Various circumstances have been noticed in the preceding chapter, which tended to connect the policy of several of the

[1] "Sub libertate Romana" was the expression which marked the regularity of the imperial administration, based on rules of procedure and law, as opposed to an arbitrary despotism.

emperors who reigned during the fifth century with the interests of their subjects. Justinian found order introduced into every branch of the public administration, immense wealth accumulated in the imperial treasury, discipline re-established in the army, and the church eager to support an orthodox emperor. Unfortunately for mankind, this increase in the power of the emperor rendered him independent of the goodwill of his subjects, whose interests seemed to him subordinate to the exigencies of the public administration; and his reign proved one of the most injurious, in the history of the Roman empire, to the moral and political condition of its subjects. In forming an opinion concerning the events of Justinian's reign, it must be borne in mind that the foundation of its power and glory was laid by Anastasius, while Justinian sowed the seeds of the misfortunes of Maurice; and, by persecuting the very nationality of his heterodox subjects, prepared the way for the conquests of the Mussulmans.

Justinian mounted the throne with the feelings, and in the position, of a hereditary sovereign, prepared, however, by every advantage of circumstance, to hold out the expectation of a wise and prudent reign. Born and educated in a private station, he had attained the mature age of forty-five before he ascended the throne.[1] He had received an excellent education. He was a man of honourable intentions, and of a laborious disposition, attentive to business, and well versed in law and theology; but his abilities were moderate, his judgment was feeble, and he was deficient in decision of character. Simple in his own habits, he, nevertheless, added to the pomp and ceremonial of the imperial court, and strove to make the isolation of the emperor, as a superior being, visible in the public pageantry of government. Though ambitious of glory, he was infinitely more attentive to the exhibition of his power than to the adoption of measures for securing the essentials of national strength.

The Eastern Empire was an absolute monarchy, of a regular and systematic form. The emperor was the head of the government, and the master of all those engaged in the

1 It would answer no purpose to crowd the pages of this work with references to Procopius. The statements in the Anecdotes, the Edifices, and the Histories, are too dissimilar to be cited together without explanations. Yet Procopius seems a valuable authority even in his anecdotes, and he shows himself often credulous in his Histories. Justinian appears to have been descended from a Sclavonic family. His father's name was Istok, of which Sabbatios is a translation. His mother and sister were named Wiglenitza. His own native name was Uprawda, corresponding to *jus*, *justitia*. Schafarik, *Slavische Alterthümer*, ii. 160; and Aleman's notes to the *Hist. Arcana* of Procopius, p. 418, edit. Bonn.

public service; but the administration was an immense establishment, artfully and scientifically constructed in its details.[1] The numerous individuals employed in each ministerial department of the State consisted of a body of men appropriated to that special service, which they were compelled to study attentively, to which they devoted their lives, and in which they were sure to rise by talents and industry. Each department of the State formed a separate profession, as completely distinct, and as perfectly organised in its internal arrangements, as the legal profession is in modern Europe. A Roman emperor would no more have thought of suddenly creating a financier, or an administrator, than a modern sovereign would think of making a lawyer. This circumstance explains at once how education and official knowledge were so long and so well preserved in the Roman administration, where, as in the law and the church, they flourished for ages after the extinction of literary acquirements in all other classes of the people;[2] and it affords also an explanation of the singular duration of the Roman government, and of its inherent principle of vitality. If it wanted the energy necessary for its own regeneration, which could only have proceeded from the influence of a free people on the sovereign power, it at least escaped the evils of official anarchy and vacillating government. Nothing but this systematic composition of the multifarious branches of the Roman administration could have preserved the empire from dissolution during the period in which it was a prey to internal wars and foreign invasions; and this supremacy of the system over the will of individuals gave a character of immutability to administrative procedure, which warranted the boast of the subjects of Constantine and Justinian that they lived under the protection of the Roman constitution. The greatest imperfection of the government arose from the total want of any popular control over the moral conduct of the public servants. Political morality, like pure taste, cannot live without the atmosphere of public opinion.[3]

[1] No correct idea of the Roman administration can be formed, without consulting the *Notitia Dignitatum et Administrationum*, in the excellent edition of Dr. Boecking, Bonn, 1839, &c.

[2] The law of Valentinian, forbidding students to remain in Rome after the twentieth year of their age, shows that restrictions were put on education.—*Cod. Theod.* xiv. 9, 1.

[3] When we blame the evils of the Roman government, we ought not to overlook the inconveniences which would result in a declining state of society, from the neglect of general interests in large representative assemblies, intent on temporary expedients, and incapable, at such a period, of attending to anything but local claims.

The state of society in the Eastern Empire underwent far greater changes than the imperial administration. The race of wealthy nobles, whose princely fortunes and independent bearing had excited the fears and the avarice of the early Cæsars, had been long extinct. The imperial court and household now included all the higher classes in the capital. The senate was now only a corps of officials, and the people had no position in the State but that of tax-payers. While the officers of the civil, finance, and judicial departments, the clergy and the military, were the servants of the emperor, the people, the Roman people, were his slaves.[1] No connecting link of common interest or national sympathy united the various classes as one body, and connected them with the emperor. The only bond of union was one of universal oppression, as everything in the imperial government had become subordinate to the necessity of supplying the treasury with money. The fiscal severity of the Roman government had for centuries been gradually absorbing all the accumulated wealth of society, as the possession of large fortunes was almost sure to entail their confiscation. Even if the wealth of the higher classes in the provinces escaped this fate, it was, by the constitution of the empire, rendered responsible for the deficiencies which might occur in the taxes of the districts from which it was obtained; and thus the rich were everywhere rapidly sinking to the level of the general poverty. The destruction of the higher classes of society had swept away all the independent landed proprietors before Justinian commenced his series of reforms in the provinces.

The effect of these reforms extended to future times, and exercised an important influence on the internal composition of the Greek people. In ancient times, a very large portion of society consisted of slaves. They formed the great body of the rural population; and, as they received no moral training, they were inferior, in every mental quality, to the barbarians of the north: from this very cause they were utterly incapable of making any exertion to improve their condition; and whether the province which they inhabited belonged to the Romans or Greeks, the Goths or the Huns, they remained equally slaves. The oppressive system of the Roman financial administration,

[1] The Roman people now consisted chiefly of Greeks; but Latin seems to have been spoken in Illyricum and Thrace by a very numerous portion of the population. Perhaps the original languages of these countries blended easily with Latin from being cognate tongues, and soon began to form dialects which time has now modified into the Vallachian and Albanian languages of the present day.

by depressing the higher classes, and impoverishing the rich, found the lower orders at last burdened with the great part of the land-tax. The labourer of the soil became an object of great interest to the treasury, and, as the chief instrument in furnishing the financial resources of the State, obtained almost as important a position in the eyes of the fisc as the landed proprietor himself. The first laws which conferred any rights on the slave, are those which the Roman government enacted to prevent the landed proprietors from transferring their slaves engaged in the cultivation of lands, assessed for the land-tax, to other employments which, though more profitable to the proprietor of the slave, would have yielded a smaller or less permanent, return to the imperial treasury.[1] The avarice of the imperial treasury, by reducing the mass of the free population to the same degree of poverty as the slaves, had removed one cause of the separation of the two classes. The position of the slave had lost most of its moral degradation, and occupied precisely the same political position in society as the poor labourer, from the moment that the Roman fiscal laws compelled any freeman who had cultivated lands for the space of thirty years to remain for ever attached, with his descendants, to the same estate.[2] The lower orders were from that period blended into one class: the slave rose to be a member of this body; the freeman descended, but his descent was necessary for the improvement of the great bulk of the human race, and for the extinction of slavery. Such was the progress of civilisation in the Eastern Empire. The measures of Justinian which, by their fiscal rapacity, tended to sink the free population to the same state of poverty as the slaves, really prepared the way for the rise of the slaves as soon as any general improvement took place in the condition of the human race.

Justinian found the central administration still aided and controlled by the municipal institutions and the numerous corporate communities throughout the empire, as well as by the religious assemblies of the orthodox and heterodox congregations. Many of these bodies possessed large revenues. The fabric of the ancient world still existed. Consuls were still named. Rome, though subject to the Goths, preserved its senate. Constantinople enjoyed all the license of the hippodrome; Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and

[1] *Cod. Theod.* xi. tit. 3, 1, 2. *Cod. Just.* xi. tit. 48.
[2] *Cod. Just.* xi. tit. 48, 1, 19; and 1, 23. See page 160.

many other cities, received public distributions of grain. Athens and Sparta were still governed as little states, and a body of Greek provincial militia still guarded the pass of Thermopylæ. The Greek cities possessed their own revenues, and maintained their roads, schools, hospitals, police, public buildings, and aqueducts; they paid professors and public physicians, and kept their streets paved, cleaned, and lighted. The people enjoyed their local festivals and games; and though music had supplanted poetry, the theatres were still open for the public amusement.

Justinian defaced these traces of the ancient world far more rapidly in Greece than Theodoric in Italy. He was a merciless reformer, and his reforms were directed solely by fiscal calculations.[1] The importance of the consulate was abolished, to save the expenses attendant on the installation of the consuls. The Roman senators were exterminated in the Italian wars, during which the ancient race of the inhabitants of Rome was nearly destroyed.[2] Alexandria was deprived of its supplies of grain, and the Greeks in Egypt were reduced in number and consideration. Antioch was sacked by Chosroes, and the position of the Greek population of Syria permanently weakened.

But it was in Greece itself that the Hellenic race and institutions received the severest blow. Justinian seized the revenues of the free cities, and deprived them of their most valuable privileges, for the loss of their revenues compromised their political existence. Poverty produced barbarism. Roads, streets, and public buildings could no longer be repaired or constructed unless by the imperial treasury. That want of police which characterises the middle ages, began to be felt in the East. Public instruction was neglected, but the public charities were liberally supported; the professors and the physicians were robbed of the funds destined for their maintenance. The municipalities themselves continued to exist in an enfeebled state, for Justinian affected to reform, but never attempted to destroy them; and even his libeller, Procopius, only accuses him of plundering, not of destroying them. The poverty of the Greeks rendered it impossible

1 Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* p. 74, 76, edit. Par.

2 When Rome was repeopled, a senate seems to have again arisen, but it only perpetuated the name, and a mortal blow was given to the power of the municipality. The Pope assumed the direction of civil affairs, and prepared the way for his future temporal sovereignty.—See *Geschichte des Roemischen Rechts im Mittelalter.* F. C. Von Savigny. Vol. i. p. 367.

for them to supply their municipalities with new funds, or even to allow local taxes to be imposed, for maintaining the old establishments. At this crisis, the population was saved from utter barbarism by the close connection which existed between the clergy and the people, and the powerful influence of the church. The clergy and the people being united by a community of language, feelings, and prejudices, the clergy, as the most powerful class of the community, henceforth took the lead in all public business in the provinces. They lent their aid to support the charitable institutions, to replace the means of instruction, and to maintain the knowledge of the healing art; they supported the communal and municipal organisation of the people; but, while preserving the local feelings of the Greeks, they strengthened the foundations of a national organisation. History supplies few materials to illustrate the precise period at which the clergy in Greece formed their alliance with the municipal organisation of the people, independent of the central authority; but the alliance became of great national importance, and began to exercise permanent effects on the social existence of the Greeks, after the municipalities had been impoverished by Justinian's reforms.

Section II

Military Forces of the Empire

The history of the wars and conquests of Justinian is narrated by Procopius, the secretary of Belisarius, who was often an eye-witness of the events which he records with a minuteness which supplies much valuable information on the military system of the age. The expeditions of the Roman armies were so widely extended that most of the nations of the world were brought into direct communication with the empire. During the time Justinian's generals were changing the state of Europe, and destroying some of the nations which had dismembered the Western Empire, circumstances beyond the control of that international system of policy, of which the sovereigns of Constantinople and Persia were the arbiters, produced a general movement in the population of central Asia. The whole human race was thrown into a state of convulsive agitation, from the frontiers of China to the shores of the Atlantic. This agitation destroyed many of the existing

governments, and exterminated several powerful nations, while, at the same time, it laid the foundation of the power of new states and nations, some of which have maintained their existence to the present times.

The Eastern Empire bore no inconsiderable part in raising this mighty storm in the West, and in quelling its violence in the East; in exterminating the Goths and Vandals, and in arresting the progress of the Avars and Turks. Yet the number and composition of the Roman armies have often been treated by historians as weak and contemptible. It is impossible, in this sketch, to attempt any examination of the whole military establishment of the Roman empire during Justinian's reign; but in noticing the influence exercised by the military system on the Greek population, it is necessary to make a few general observations.[1] The army consisted of two distinct classes,—the regular troops, and the mercenaries. The regular troops were composed both of native subjects of the Roman empire, raised by conscription, and of barbarians, who had been allowed to occupy lands within the emperor's dominions, and to retain their own usages on the condition of furnishing a fixed number of recruits for the army. The Roman government still clung to the great law of the empire, that the portion of its subjects which paid the land-tax could not be allowed to escape that burden by entering the army.[2] The proprietors of the land were responsible for the tribute; the cultivators of the soil, both slaves and serfs, secured the amount of the public revenues; neither could be permitted to forego their fiscal obligations for their military duties.[3] For some centuries it had been more economical to purchase the service of the barbarians than to employ native troops; and perhaps, if the oppressive system of the imperial administration had not impaired the resources of the State, and diminished the population by consuming the capital of the people, this might have long continued to be the case. Native troops were always drawn from the mountainous districts, which paid a scanty tribute, and in which the population found difficulty in procuring subsistence. The invasions

[1] Lord Mahon, in his *Life of Belisarius* (chap. i.), gives a sketch of the Roman armies in Justinian's reign.

[2] *Cod. Just.* x. 32, 17; xii. 32, 2, 4. He who quitted his civil position as servant of the fisc was to be sent back to his duty. Citizens were not allowed to possess arms, except for hunting and travelling.

[3] The exemption of the military from taxation was used as an argument for conceding a similar privilege to the clergy, who were members of the militia warring against the legions of Satan.

of the barbarians, likewise, threw numbers of the peasantry of the provinces to the south of the Danube out of employment, and many of these entered the army. A supply of recruits was likewise obtained from the idle and needy population of the towns.[1] The most active and intelligent soldiers were placed in the cavalry,—a force that was drilled with the greatest care, subjected to the most exact discipline, and sustained the glory of the Roman arms in the field of battle.[2] As the higher and middle classes in the provinces had, for ages, been excluded from the military profession, and the army had been at last composed chiefly of the rudest and most ignorant peasants, of enfranchised slaves, and naturalised barbarians, military service was viewed with aversion; and the greatest repugnance arose among the civilians to become soldiers. In the mean time, the depopulation of the empire daily increased the difficulty of raising the number of recruits required for a service which embraced an immense extent of territory, and entailed a great destruction of human life.

The troops of the line, particularly the infantry, had deteriorated considerably in Justinian's time; but the artillery and engineer departments were not much inferior, in science and efficiency, to what they had been in the best days of the empire. Military resources, not military knowledge, had diminished. The same arsenals continued to exist; mere mechanical skill had been uninterruptedly exercised; and the constant demand which had existed for military mechanicians, armourers, and engineers, had never allowed the theoretical instruction of this class to be neglected, nor their practical skill to decline from want of employment. This fact requires to be borne in mind.[3]

[1] Slaves were, of course, excluded from military service by the Roman laws.—*Cod. Just.* xii. 33. 6, 7. Yet, in the decline of the empire, they were sometimes enfranchised in order to be admitted as recruits; and Justinian declares the slave free who had served in the army with his master's consent. The enactment proves that slaves were rapidly attaining the level to which the free population had sunk.—*Novell.* 81. Colons were also excluded from military service.—*Cod. Just.* xi. 48, 18.

[2] The cavalry was carefully trained to act on foot, and its steady behaviour on dismounting, when surrounded by superior numbers, proves the perfection of the Roman discipline, even in the time of Justinian. Procopius mentions this trait in his description of the battle of Callinicum.—*De Bell. Pers.* i. 18. Salomon made use of the same formation of the cavalry on foot against the African Moors. *Famil.* book, ii. c. 12. It was again employed at the battle of Solacon, in the reign of the emperor Maurice. Theophylactus, *Simoc.* ii. 4. Hannibal ridiculed the conduct of Æmilius Paulus in ordering the Roman cavalry to dismount at the battle of Cannæ. But there is no invariable rule in war.

[3] The engineers of Theodoric the Great could not be superior to those of Justinian, for Theodoric had often been obliged to obtain artists from the East; yet the tomb of Theodoric, near Ravenna, rivals the remains of the ante-Homeric times at Mycenæ. The circular stone of the dome is 35 feet in diameter, and weighs 940,000 lb.; yet it is

The mercenaries formed the most valued and brilliant portion of the army; and it was the fashion of the day to copy and admire the dress and manners of the barbarian cavalry. The empire was now surrounded by numbers of petty princes, who, though they had seized possession of provinces once belonging to the Romans, by force, and had often engaged in war with the emperor, still acknowledged a certain degree of dependence on the Roman power. Some of them, as the kings of the Heruls and the Gepids, and the king of Colchis, held their regal rank, by a regular investiture, from Justinian. These princes, and the kings of the Lombards, Huns, Saracens, and Moors, all received regular subsidies. Some of them furnished a number of their best warriors, who entered the Roman service, and served in separate bands, under their own leaders, and with their national weapons, but subjected to the regular organisation and discipline of the Roman armies, though not to the Roman system of military exercises and manœuvres. Some of these corps of barbarians were also formed of volunteers, who were attracted by the high pay which they received, and the license with which they were allowed to behave.

The superiority of these troops arose from natural causes. The northern nations who invaded the empire consisted of a population trained from infancy to warlike exercises, and following no profession but that of arms. Their lands were cultivated by the labour of their slaves, or by that of the Roman subjects who still survived in the provinces they had occupied; but their only pecuniary resources arose from the plunder of their neighbours, or the subsidies of the Roman emperors. Their habits of life, the celerity of their movements, and the excellence of their armour, rendered them the choicest troops of the age; and their most active warriors were generally engaged to serve in the imperial forces. The emperors preferred armies composed of a number of motley bands of mercenary foreigners, attached to their own persons by high pay, and commanded by chiefs who could never pretend to political rank, and who had much to lose and little to gain by rebellion; for experience proved that they perilled their throne by intrusting the command of a national army to a native general, who, from a popular soldier, might become a

supposed to have been brought from the quarries in Istria.—See the plates in the *Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens, depuis sa Décadence au IV^e Siècle*, par Seroux D'Agincourt, tom. i. pl. xviii.

dangerous rival.[1] Though the barbarian mercenaries in the service of Rome generally proved far more efficient troops than their free countrymen, yet they were on the whole unequal to the native Roman cavalry of Justinian's army, the Cataphracti, sheathed in complete steel on the Persian model and armed with the Grecian spear, who were still the best troops in a field of battle, and were the real type of the chivalry of the middle ages.

Justinian weakened the Roman army in several ways by his measures of reform. His anxiety to reduce its expenditure induced him to diminish the establishment of camels, horses and chariots, which attended the troops for transporting the military machines and baggage. This train had been previously very large, as it was calculated to save the peasantry from any danger of having their labours interrupted, or their cattle seized, under the pretext of being required for transport. Numerous abuses were introduced by diminishing the pay of the troops, and by neglecting to pay them with regularity and to furnish them with proper food and clothing. At the same time, the efficiency of the army in the field was more seriously injured, by continuing the policy adopted by Anastasius, of restricting the power of the generals; a policy, however, which, it must be confessed, was not unnecessary in order to avoid greater evils. This is evident from the numerous rebellions in Justinian's reign, and the absolute want of any national or patriotic feeling in the majority of the Roman officers. Large armies were at times composed of a number of corps, each commanded by its own officer, over whom the nominal commander-in-chief had little or no authority; and it is to this circumstance that the unfortunate results of some of the Gothic and Persian campaigns are to be attributed, and not to any inferiority of the Roman troops. Even Belisarius himself, though he gave many proofs of attachment to Justinian's throne, was watched with the greatest jealousy. He was treated with constant distrust, and his officers were at times encouraged to dispute his measures, and never punished for disobeying his orders.[2] The fact is, that

[1] Justinian, however, sometimes united the civil and military power.—*Novell.* 24–31.

[2] Narses had evidently been sent to Italy by Justinian before the conquest of Witiges, expressly to watch Belisarius, and guard against his acquiring too much personal influence over the troops. The circumstance of officers of rank being allowed to maintain a large body-guard of cavalry, the members of which swore fidelity to their chief, as well as allegiance to the emperor, is a singular fact when contrasted with the imperial jealousy. The guards of Belisarius amounted to seven thousand horsemen

Belisarius might, if so disposed, have assumed the purple, and perhaps dethroned his master. Narses was the only general who was implicitly trusted and steadily supported; but Narses was an aged eunuch, and could never have become emperor.

The imperial military forces consisted of one hundred and fifty thousand men; and though the extent of the frontier which these troops were compelled to guard was very great, and lay open to the incursions of many active hostile tribes, still Justinian was able to assemble some admirably appointed armies for his foreign expeditions.[1] The armament which accompanied Belisarius to Africa consisted of ten thousand infantry, five thousand cavalry, and twenty thousand sailors. Belisarius must have had about thirty thousand troops under his command in Italy before the taking of Ravenna. Germanus, when he arrived in Africa, found that only one-third of the Roman troops about Carthage had remained faithful, and the rebels under Stozas amounted to eight thousand men. As there were still troops in Numidia which had not joined the deserters, the whole Roman force in Africa cannot have been less than fifteen thousand. Narses, in the year 551, when the empire began to show evident proofs of the bad effects of Justinian's government, could assemble thirty thousand chosen troops, an army which defeated the veterans of Totila, and destroyed the fierce bands of Franks and Alemanns which hoped to wrest Italy from the Romans. The character of the Roman troops, in spite of all that modern writers have said to depreciate them, still stood so high that Totila, the warlike monarch of the Goths, strove to induce them to join his standard by offers of high pay. No army had yet proved itself equal to the Roman on the field of battle; and their exploits in Spain, Africa, Colchis, and Mesopotamia, prove their excellence; though the defeats which they sustained, both from the Persians and on the Danube, reveal the fact that their enemies were improving in military

after his return from the conquest of Italy.—Procopius, *Goth.* iii. c. 1, vol. iii. p. 283, edit. Bonn. Crassus is reported to have said that he only could be called a rich man who could maintain an army. The households of Piso and his wife Plancina were so numerous, that when Piso resisted the orders of Germanicus, he armed several thousand slaves and formed a corps equal to a Roman legion.—Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 80.

[1] Agathias states that the military establishment of the empire once consisted of 645,000 men. The statement seems to have rested on official documents, as it is repeated by another writer. It probably included the local militia and the garrisons, as well as the regular army.—Agathias, v. 157. edit. Par. Joannes Antiochenus, *Frag. Historicorum Græc.* iv. 622, edit. Didot. See the note to the Anecdotes of Procopius, p. 164, edit. Par., and vol. iii. p. 454, of the edition of Bonn. Gibbon (i. 27) states the Roman forces, in the time of Hadrian, at 375,000, a number which seems too small for anything but the regular army.

science, and watching every opportunity of availing themselves of any neglect of the Roman government in maintaining the efficiency of the army.

Numerous examples could be cited of almost incredible disorders in the armies,—originating generally in the misconduct of the imperial government. Belisarius attempted but found it impossible, to enforce strict discipline,[1] when the soldiers were unpaid, and the officers authorised to act independently of his orders. Two thousand Heruls ventured to quit his standard in Italy, and, after marching round the Adriatic, were pardoned by Justinian, and again engaged in the imperial service. Procopius mentions repeatedly that the conduct of the unpaid and unpunished troops ruined the provinces; and in Africa, no less than three Roman officers, Stozas, Maximin, and Gontharis, attempted to render themselves independent, and were supported by large bodies of troops.[2] The Greeks were the only portion of the population who were considered as sincerely attached to the imperial government, or, at least, who would readily defend it against every enemy; and accordingly, Gontharis, when he wished to secure Carthage, ordered all the Greeks to be murdered without distinction. The Greeks were, however, from their position and rank in society as burgesses or tax-payers, almost entirely excluded from the army, and though they furnished the greater part of the sailors for the fleet, they were generally an unwarlike population. Witiges, the Gothic king, calls the Roman army of Belisarius an army of Greeks, a band of pirates, actors, and mountebanks.[3]

One of the most unfortunate measures of Justinian was the disbanding all the provincial militia. This is incidentally mentioned in the Secret History of Procopius, who informs us that Thermopylæ had been previously guarded by two thousand of this militia; but that this corps was dissolved, and a garrison of regular troops placed in Greece.[4] As a general measure it was probably dictated by a plan of financial reform, and not by any fear of popular insurrection; but its

[1] At the commencement of his African expedition he executed two Huns for killing one of their companions in a drunken quarrel.—Procopius, *Vand.* i. c. 12. Belisarius, in addressing his troops, told them that the Persians did not surpass them in valour, but excelled them in discipline.—Procopius, *Pers.* i. c. 14.

[2] Constantine, one of the officers of the army in Italy, attempted to assassinate Belisarius, who had ordered him to restore property which he had plundered. The African army rebelled against John the patrician.—Corippus, vii. 50. The garrison of Petra entered the service of Chosroes.—Procopius, *Pers.* ii. 17. That of Spoleto joined Totila.—*Goth.* iii. 12; iv. 26.

[3] Procopius, *Goth.* i. c. 18, 20.

[4] Procopius, *Hist. An.* 26; vol. iii. 147, edit. Bonn. *Goth.* iv. 26.

effects were extremely injurious to the empire in the declining state of society, and in the increasing disorganisation of the central power; and though it may possibly have prevented some provinces from recovering their independence by their own arms, it prepared the way for the easy conquests of the Avars and Arabs. Justinian was desirous of centralising all power, and rendering all public burdens uniform and systematic; and had adopted the opinion that it was cheaper to defend the empire by walls and fortresses than by a movable army. The practice of moving the troops with great celerity to defend the frontiers, had induced the officers to abandon the ancient practice of fortifying a regular camp; and at last, even the art of encamping was neglected.[1] The barbarians, however, could always move with greater rapidity than the regular troops of the empire.

To secure the frontiers, Justinian adopted a plan of constructing extensive lines supported by innumerable forts and castles, in which he placed garrisons, in order that they might be ready to sally out on the invading bands. These lines extended from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, and were farther strengthened by the long wall of Anastasius, which covered Constantinople by walls protecting the Thracian Chersonesus and the Peninsula of Pallene, and by fortifications at Thermopylæ, and at the Isthmus of Corinth, which were all carefully repaired. At all these posts permanent garrisons were maintained. The eulogy of Procopius on the public edifices of Justinian seems almost irreconcilable with the events of the latter years of his reign; for Zabergan, king of the Huns, penetrated through breaches he found unrepaired in the long wall, and advanced almost to the very suburbs of Constantinople.[2]

Another instance of the declining state of military tactics may be mentioned, as it must have originated in the army itself, and not in consequence of any arrangements of the government. The combined manœuvres of the divisions of the regiments had been so neglected that the bugle-calls once used had fallen into desuetude, and were unknown to the soldiers. The motley recruits, of dissimilar habits, could not acquire, with the requisite rapidity, a perception of the delicacy of the ancient music, and the Roman infantry no longer moved

> In perfect phalanx, to the Dorian mood,
> Of flutes and soft recorders.

1 *Menandri Frag.* p. 440, edit. Bonn.

2 See *infra*, page 254.

It happened, during the siege of Auximum in Italy, that Belisarius was placed in difficulty from the want of an instantaneous means of communicating orders to the troops engaged in skirmishing with the Goths. On this occasion it was suggested to him by Procopius, his secretary and the historian of his wars, to replace the forgotten bugle-calls by making use of the brazen trumpet of the cavalry to sound a charge, and of the infantry bugle to summon a retreat.[1]

Foreigners were preferred by the emperors as the occupants of the highest military commands; and the confidence with which the barbarian chiefs were honoured by the court enabled many to reach the highest rank in the army. Narses, the most distinguished military leader after Belisarius, was a Pers-Armenian captive. Peter, who commanded against the Persians in the campaign of 528, was also a Pers-Armenian. Pharas, who besieged Gelimer in Mount Pappua, was a Herul. Mundus, who commanded in Illyria and Dalmatia, was a Gepid prince.[2] Chilbud, who, after several victories, perished with his army in defending the frontiers against the Sclavonians, was of northern descent, as may be inferred from his name. Salomon, who governed Africa with great courage and ability, was a eunuch from Dara. Artaban was an Armenian prince. John Troglita, the patrician, the hero of the poem of Corippus, called the Johannid, is also supposed to have been an Armenian.[3] Yet the empire might still have furnished excellent officers, as well as valiant troops; for the Isaurians and Thracians continued to distinguish themselves in every field of battle, and were equal in courage to the fiercest of the barbarians.

It became the fashion in the army to imitate the manners and habits of the barbarians; their headlong personal courage became the most admired quality, even in the highest rank; and nothing tended more to hasten the decay of the military art. The officers in the Roman armies became more intent on distinguishing themselves for personal exploits than for exact order and strict discipline in their corps. Even Belisarius himself appears at times to have forgotten the duties of a general in his eagerness to exhibit his personal valour on his

[1] Procopius, *Gotth.* ii. 24. The bugle of the infantry was composed of wood and leather.

[2] Joan. Malalas, p. alt. 64, edit. Ven.

[3] Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, tom. ix. 91, 93. *Notes de Saint Martin.* Many more might be added. John, the Armenian, was killed in the pursuit of Gelimer. Akoum, a Hun, commanded the troops in Illyria.—Theoph. p. 184. Peran, son of a king of Iberia; Bessas, a Goth, but subject of the empire; Isak, an Armenian; Philemuth, a Hun, were all generals. See the Index to Procopius.

ay charger; though he may, on such occasions, have con-idered that the necessity of keeping up the spirits of his rmy was a sufficient apology for his rashness. Unquestion-bly the army, as a military establishment, had declined in xcellence ere Justinian ascended the throne, and his reign ended to sink it much lower; yet it is probable that it was ever more remarkable for the enterprising valour of its fficers, or for their personal skill in the use of their weapons. The death of numbers of the highest rank in battles and kirmishes in which they rashly engaged, proves this fact. There was, however, one important feature of ancient tactics still preserved in the Roman armies, which gave them a decided superiority over their enemies. They had still the confidence in their discipline and skill to form their ranks, and encounter their opponents in line; the bravest of their enemies, whether on the banks of the Danube or the Tigris, only ventured to charge them, or receive their attack, in close masses.[1]

Section III

Influence of Justinian's Legislation on the Greek Population

The Greeks long remained strangers to the Roman law. The free cities continued to be governed by their own legal systems and local usages, and the Greek lawyers did not consider it necessary to study the civil law of their masters. But this state of things underwent a great modification, after Constantine transformed the Greek town of Byzantium into the Roman city of Constantinople. The imperial administration, after that period, came into more immediate connection with its eastern subjects; the legislative power of the emperors was more frequently exercised in the regulation of provincial business; and the Christian church, by uniting the whole Greek population into one body, often called forth general measures of legislation. While the confusion arising from the incongruity of old laws to the new exigencies of society was generally felt, the increasing poverty, depopulation, and want of education in the Greek cities, rendered it difficult to maintain the ancient tribunals. The Greeks were often compelled to study at the universities where Roman

[1] Even the rebel troops in Africa fought in bands, like barbarians, and not in regular ranks, like Romans.

jurisprudence alone was cultivated, and thus the municipal law-courts were at last guided in their decisions by the rules of Roman law. As the number of the native tribunals decreased their duties were performed by judges named by the imperial administration; and thus Roman law, silently, and without any violent change or direct legislative enactment, was generally introduced into Greece.

Justinian, from the moment of his accession to the throne, devoted his attention to the improvement of every department of government, and carried his favourite plan, of centralising the direction of the complicated machine of the Roman administration in his own person, as far as possible. The necessity of condensing the various authorities of Roman jurisprudence, and of reducing the mass of legal opinions of eminent lawyers into a system of legislative enactments, possessing unity of form and facility of reference, was deeply felt. Such a system of legislation is useful in every country; but it becomes peculiarly necessary, after a long period of civilisation, in an absolute monarchy, in order to restrain the decisions of legal tribunals by published law, and prevent the judges from assuming arbitrary power, under the pretext of interpreting obsolete edicts and conflicting decisions. A code of laws, to a certain degree, serves as a barrier against despotism, for it supplies the people with the means of calmly confuting the acts of their government and the decisions of their judges by recognised principles of justice; and at the same time it is a useful ally to the absolute sovereign, as it supplies him with increased facilities for detecting legal injustice committed by his official agents.

The faults or merits of Justinian's system of laws belong to the lawyers intrusted with the execution of his project, but the honour of having commanded this work may be ascribed to the emperor alone. It is to be regretted that the position of an absolute sovereign is so liable to temptation from passing events, that Justinian himself could not refrain from injuring the surest monument of his fame, by later enactments, which mark too clearly that they emanated either from his own increasing avarice, or from weakness in yielding to the passions of his wife or courtiers.[1] It could not be expected that his political sagacity should have devised the means of securing the rights of his subjects against the arbitrary exercise of his own power; but he might have consecrated the great

[1] Justinian indicates that he was sensible of this.—*Cod. Just.* xii. 24, 2.

principle of equity, that legislation can never act as a retrospective decision; and he might have ordered his magistrates to adopt the oath of the Egyptian judges, who swore, when they entered an office, that they would never depart from the principles of equity (law), and that if the sovereign ordered them to do wrong, they would not obey. Justinian, however, was too much of a despot, and too little of a statesman, to proclaim the law, even while retaining the legislative power in his person, to be superior to the executive branch of the government. But in maintaining that the laws of Justinian might have been rendered more perfect, and have been framed to confer greater benefits on mankind, it is not to be denied that the work is one of the most remarkable monuments of human wisdom; and we should remember with gratitude, that for thirteen hundred years the Pandects served as the magazine or source of legal lore, and constitution of civil rights, to the Christian world, both in the East and in the West; and if it has now become an instrument of administrative tyranny in the continental monarchies of Europe, the fault is in the nations who refuse to follow out the principles of equity logically in regulating the dispensation of justice, and do not raise the law above the sovereign, nor render every minister and public servant amenable to the regular tribunals for every act he may commit in the exercise of his official duty, like the humblest citizen.[1]

The government of Justinian's empire was Roman, its official language was Latin. Oriental habits and usages, as well as time and despotic power, had indeed introduced modifications in the old forms; but it would be an error to consider the imperial administration as having assumed a Greek character. The accident of the Greek language having become the ordinary dialect in use at court, and of the church in the Eastern Empire being deeply tinctured with Greek feelings, is apt to create an impression that the Eastern Empire had lost something of its Roman pride, in order to adopt a Greek character. The circumstance that its enemies

[1] In Continental constitutions there is generally an article declaring that all citizens are equal before the law, and yet this is followed by others which allow the sovereign to establish exceptional tribunals for judging the conduct of government officials, according to a system of privileges and immunities called administrative law. Where true liberty exists, every agent of the administration, from the gendarme to the finance minister, must be rendered personally responsible to the citizen whom his act affects for the legality of every act he carries into execution. This is the real foundation of English liberty, and the great legal principle which distinguishes the law of England from the laws of the continental nations of Europe and that of Rome, from which they are derived.

often reproached it with being Greek, is a proof that this imputation was viewed as an insult. As the administration was entirely Roman, the laws of Justinian—the Code, the Pandects, and the Institutions—were published in Latin, though many of the latter edicts (novells) were published in Greek. Nothing can illustrate in a stronger manner the artificial and anti-national position of the eastern Roman empire than this fact, that the Latin language was used in the promulgation of a system of laws for an empire, the language of whose church and literature was Greek. Latin was preserved in official business, and in public ceremonials, from feelings of pride connected with the ancient renown of the Romans, and the dignity of the Roman empire. So strong is the hold which antiquated custom maintains over the mind of men, that even a professed reformer, like Justinian, could not break through so irrational an usage as the publication of his laws in a language incomprehensible to most of those for whose use they were framed.

The laws and legislation of Justinian throw only an indistinct and vague light on the state of the Greek population. They were drawn entirely from Roman sources, calculated for a Roman state of society, and occupied with Roman forms and institutions. Justinian was so anxious to preserve them in all their purity, that he adopted two measures to secure them from alteration. The copyists were commanded to refrain from any abridgment, and the commentators were ordered to follow the literal sense of the laws. All schools of law were likewise forbidden, except those of Constantinople, Rome, and Berytus, a regulation which must have been adopted to guard the Roman law from being corrupted, by falling into the hands of Greek teachers, and becoming confounded with the customary law of the various Greek provinces.[1] This restriction, and the importance attached to it by the emperor, prove that the Roman law was now the universal rule of conduct in the empire. Justinian took every measure which prudence could dictate to secure the best and purest legal instruction and administration for the Roman tribunals; but only a small number of students could study in the licensed schools, and Rome, one of these schools, was, at the time of the publication of the law, in the hands of the

[1] *Const. ad Antecessores*, and *De Confirm. Digestorum*, *Cod. Just.* i. 17. 2. Joan. Malalas (p. 63, edit. Ven.) says that Justinian sent a copy of his laws to Athens as well as to Berytus.

oths. It is therefore not surprising that a rapid decline in ıe knowledge of Roman law commenced very shortly after ıe promulgation of Justinian's legislation.

Justinian's laws were soon translated into Greek without ıe emperor's requiring that these paraphrases should be ıeral; and Greek commentaries of an explanatory nature ere published. His novells were subsequently published in reek when the case required it; but it is evident that any mains of Greek laws and customs were rapidly yielding to ıe superior system of Roman legislation, perfected as this as by the judicious labours of Justinian's councillors. Some odifications were made in the jurisdiction of the judges and unicipal magistrates at this time; and we must admit the stimony of Procopius as a proof that Justinian sold judicial fices, though the vagueness of the accusation does not ford us the means of ascertaining under what pretext the ange in the earlier system was adopted. It is perhaps npossible to determine what share of authority the Greek unicipal magistrates retained in the administration of justice ıd police, after the reforms effected by Justinian in their nancial affairs, and the seizure of a large part of their local venues. The existence of Greek corporations in Italy shows ıat they possessed an acknowledged existence in the Roman mpire.

Section IV

Internal Administration, as it affected the Greeks

The internal administration of Justinian was remarkable r religious intolerance and financial rapacity.[1] Both assisted ı increasing the deep-rooted hatred of the imperial power ıroughout the provinces, and his successors soon experienced ıe bitter effects of his policy. Even the commencement of is own reign gave some alarming manifestations of the eneral feeling. The celebrated sedition of the Nika, though broke out among the factions of the amphitheatre, acquired s importance in consequence of popular dissatisfaction with ıe fiscal measures of the emperor. This sedition possesses n unfortunate celebrity in the annals of the empire, from the estruction of many public buildings and numerous works of ncient art, occasioned by the conflagrations raised by the

[1] Evagrius, iv. 29. Procopius, *Anecd.* 11.

rebels. Belisarius succeeded in suppressing it with considerable difficulty after much bloodshed, and not until Justinian had felt his throne in imminent danger. The alarm produced a lasting impression on his mind; and more than one instance occurred during his reign to remind him that popular sedition puts a limit to despotic power. At a subsequent period, an insurrection of the people compelled him to abandon a project for recruiting the imperial finances, according to a common resource of arbitrary sovereigns, by debasing the value of the coin.[1]

We possess only scanty materials for describing the condition of the Greek population during the reign of Justinian. The relations of the Greek provinces and cities with the central administration had endured for ages, slowly undergoing the changes produced by time, but without the occurrence of any general measure of reform, until the decree of Caracalla conferred on all the Greeks the rights and privileges of Roman citizens. That decree, by converting all Greeks into Romans, must have greatly modified the constitution of the free and autonomous cities; but history furnishes no means of determining with precision its effect on the inhabitants of Greece. Justinian made another great change by confiscating the local revenues of the municipalities; but in the six centuries which had elapsed from the fall of the Roman republic to the extinction of municipal freedom in the Greek cities, the prominent feature of the Roman administration had been invariably the same—fiscal rapacity which gradually depopulated the country, and prepared the way for its colonisation by foreign races.

The colossal fabric of the Roman government embraced not only a numerous imperial court and household, a host of administrators, finance agents, and judges, a powerful army and navy, and a splendid church establishment: it also conferred the privilege of titular nobility on a large portion of the higher classes, both on those who were selected to fill local offices in connection with the public administration, and on those who had held public employments during some period of their lives. The titles of this nobility were official: its members were the creatures of government, attached to the imperial throne by ties of interest: they were exempted from particular taxes, separated from the body of the people by various privileges, and formed, from their great number

[1] *Malalæ Ch.* pars. ii. p. 80, edit. Ven.

ther a distinct nation than a privileged class. They were attered over all the provinces of Justinian's empire, from the tlantic to the Euphrates, and constituted, at this period, the al nucleus of civil society in the Roman world. Of their fluence, many distinct traces may be found, even after the tinction of the Roman power, both in the East and in the est.[1]

The population of the provinces, and more especially the oprietors and cultivators of the soil, stood completely apart om these representatives of the Roman supremacy, and most in a state of direct opposition to the government. he weight of the Roman yoke had now pressed down all the ovincials to nearly the same level. As a general rule, they ere excluded from the profession of arms;[2] their poverty used them to neglect the cultivation of arts, sciences, and erature, and their whole attention was absorbed in watching ie increasing rapacity of the imperial treasury, and in finding eans to evade the oppression which they saw no possibility resisting. The land and capitation taxes formed the source this oppression. No taxes were, perhaps, more equitable their general principle, and few appear ever to have been dministered, for so long a period, with such unfeeling pru- ence. Their severity had been so gradually increased, that ut a very small annual encroachment had been made on the vings of the people, and centuries elapsed before its whole ccumulated capital was consumed; but at last the whole ealth of the empire was drawn into the imperial treasury; uit-trees were cut down, and free men were sold to pay taxes; neyards were rooted out, and buildings were destroyed to scape taxation.

The manner of collecting the land and capitation taxes isplays singular ingenuity in the mode of estimating the alue of the property to be taxed, and an inhuman sagacity framing a system capable of extracting the last farthing hich tha property could yield. The registers underwent a ublic revision every fifteenth year, but the *indictio*, or amount

1 *Notitia Dignitatum*, edit. Boecking. Lydus, *De Magistratibus Reipub. Romanæ*, 13. *C. T.* vi. tit. 5. *C. J.* xii. 8. "Ut dignitatum ordo servetur." The prefect of frica was allowed by Justinian to have three hundred and ninety-six officers and erks, and each of his lieutenants and deputies, fifty. *Cod. Just.* i. 27, 3. Arcadius id forbidden the Comes of the Orient, who was under the orders of the prefect of the ast, to have more than six hundred. *Just. C.* xii. 57. Compare Lactantius, *De Mort. ers.* 7, 4. Manso, *Leben Constantius*, p. 139.

2 The states of Greece had preserved their local militia even to Justinian's time, as ppears from the existence of the provincial guard for the defence of Thermopylæ, nich he disbanded —Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 26.

of taxation to be paid, was annually fixed by an imperi ordinance. The whole empire was divided into *capita*, hides of land.[1] The proprietors of these capita were groupe together in communities, the wealthier members of which wer formed into a permanent magistracy, and rendered liable fo the amount of the taxes due by their community. The sam law of responsibility was applied to the senates and magi trates of cities and free states. Confiscation of private pro perty had, from the earliest days of the empire, been regarde as an important financial resource. In the days of Tiberiu the nobles of Rome, whose power, influence, and characte alarmed the jealous tyrant, were swept away. Nero attacke the wealthy to fill his exhausted treasury; and from that tim to the days of Justinian, the richest individuals in the capita and the provinces had been systematically punished for ever offence by the confiscation of their fortunes. The pages c Suetonius and Tacitus, of Zosimus and Procopius, attest th extent and duration of this war against private wealth. Now in the eyes of the Roman government, the greatest politica offence was the failure to perform a public duty; and th most important duty of a Roman subject had long been t furnish the amount of taxes required by the State. The increase of the public burdens at last proceeded so far, tha every year brought with it a failure in the taxes of some pro vince, and consequently the confiscation of the private pro perty of the wealthiest citizens of the insolvent district, unti at last all the rich proprietors were ruined, and the law became nugatory. The poor and ignorant inhabitants of the rura districts in Greece forgot the literature and arts of their ances tors; and as they had no longer anything to sell, nor the means of purchasing foreign commodities, money ceased t circulate.

But though the proud aristocracy and the wealthy votaries of art, literature, and philosophy, disappeared, and though independent citizens and proprietors now stood scattered ove the provinces as isolated individuals, without exercising an direct influence on the character of the age, still the externa framework of ancient society displayed something of its pomp

[1] The capita were not only assessed at different amounts in the different provinces according to circumstances, but even in the same provinces, where they were assessed at the same amount, their size would differ according to the fertility of the district They correspond to the modern ζευγάρια. In rich lands where a part is irrigable, a zevgari is sometimes not more than thirty acres, but in sterile Attica there are zevgari of more than one hundred acres.

nd greatness. The decay of its majesty and strength was lt; mankind perceived the approach of a mighty change, but ne revolution had not yet arrived; the past glory of Greece hed its colouring on the unknown future, and the dark shadow hich that future now throws back, when we contemplate ustinian's reign, was then imperceptible.

Many of the habits, and some of the institutions of ancient ivilisation, still continued to exist among the Greek popula- ion. Property, though crumbling away under a system of low corrosion, was regarded by public opinion as secure gainst lawless violence or indiscriminate confiscation; and it eally was so, when a comparison is made between the condi- ion of a subject of the Roman empire and a proprietor of he soil in any other country of the then known world. If here was much evil in the state of society, there was also ome good; and, when contemplating it from our modern ocial position, we must never forget that the same causes hich destroyed the wealth, arts, literature, and civilisation of he Romans and Greeks, began to eradicate from among man- kind the greatest degradation of our species—the existence of lavery.

In the reign of Justinian, the Greeks as a people had lost much of their superiority over the other subjects of the empire. The schools of philosophy, which had afforded the last refuge or the ancient literature of the country, had long fallen into neglect, and were on the very eve of extinction, when Justinian closed them by a public edict. The poverty and ignorance of he inhabitants of Greece had totally separated the philoso- hers from the people. The town population had everywhere embraced Christianity. The country population, composed now in great part of the offspring of freedmen and slaves, was removed from all instruction, and paganism continued to exist in the retired mountains of the Peloponnesus. Those principles of separation which originated in non-communica- ion of ideas and interests, and which began to give the Roman empire the aspect of an agglomeration of nations, rather than the appearance of a single State, operated as powerfully on the Greek people as on the Egyptian, Syrian, and Armenian population. The needy cultivators of the soil —the artisans in the towns—and the servile dependents on the imperial administration,—formed three distinct classes of society. A strong line of distinction was created between the Greeks in the service of the empire and the body of the

people, both in the towns and country. The mass of the Greeks naturally participated in the general hostility to the Roman administration; yet the immense numbers who were employed in the State, and in the highest dignities of the Church, neutralised the popular opposition, and prevented the Greek nation from aspiring at national independence.

It has been already observed that Justinian restricted the powers and diminished the revenues of the Greek municipalities, but that these corporations continued to exist, though shorn of their former power and influence. Splendid monuments of Grecian architecture, and beautiful works of Grecian art, still adorned the Agora and the Acropolis of many cities in Greece. Where the ancient walls were falling into decay, and the untenanted buildings presented an aspect of ruin, they were cleared away to construct the new fortifications, the churches, and the monasteries, with which Justinian covered the empire. The hasty construction of these buildings, rapidly erected from the materials furnished by the ancient structures around, accounts both for their number and for the facility with which time has effaced almost every trace of their existence. Still, even in architecture, the Roman empire displayed some traces of its greatness; the church of St. Sophia, and the aqueduct of Constantinople, attest the superiority of Justinian's age over subsequent periods, both in the East and in the West.

The superiority of the Greek population must at this time have been most remarkable in their regulations of internal government and police administration.[1] Public roads were still maintained in a serviceable state, though not equal in appearance or solidity of construction to the Appian Way in Italy, which excited the admiration of Procopius.[2] Streets were kept in repair by the proprietors of the houses forming them.[3] The *astynomoi* and the *agoranomoi* were still elected, but their number often indicated the former greatness of a diminished population. The post-houses, post-mansions, and every means of transport, were maintained in good order, but they had long been rendered a means of oppressing the people;

[1] Procopius, in the *Secret History*, accuses Justinian of neglecting the public aqueducts, but we have no data for ascertaining the precise changes he effected in the water police and administration. The names of the modern officers charged with the distribution of the water of the Cephissus for irrigation, and of the water of the ancient subterraneous aqueduct which supplies Athens, and which supplied it before the days of Pericles, are ποταμάρχης and νεροκράτης.

[2] *De Bello Gotth.* i. 14.

[3] *Dig.* xliii. 10, 11.

and, though laws had often been passed to prevent the provincials from suffering from the exactions of imperial officers when travelling, the extent of the abuses was beginning to ruin the establishment.[1] The Roman empire, to the latest period of its existence, paid considerable attention to the police of the public roads, and it was indebted to this care for the preservation of its military superiority over its enemies, and of its lucrative commerce.

The activity of the government in clearing the country of robbers and banditti, and the singular severity of the laws on this subject, show that the slightest danger of a diminution of the imperial revenues inspired the Roman government with energy and vigour.[2] Nor were other means of advancing the commercial interests of the people neglected. The ports were carefully cleaned, and their entry indicated by lighthouses, as in earlier times;[3] and, in short, only that portion of ancient civilisation which was too expensive for the diminished resources of the age had fallen into neglect. Utility and convenience were universally sought, both in private and public life; but solidity, taste, and the durability which aspires at immortality, were no longer regarded as objects of attainable ambition. The basilica, or the monastery, constructed by breaking to pieces the solid blocks of a neglected temple, and cemented together by lime burnt from the marble of the desecrated shrine, or from some heathen tomb, was intended to contain a certain number of persons; and the cost of the building, and its temporary sufficiency for the required purpose, were just as much the general object of the architect's attention in the time of Justinian as in our own.

The worst feature of Justinian's administration was its venality. This vice, it is true, generally prevails in every administration uninfluenced by public opinion, and based on an organised bureaucracy; for whenever the corps of administrators becomes too numerous for the moral character of individuals to be under the direct control of their superiors, usage secures to them a permanent official position, unless they grossly neglect their duties. Justinian, however, countenanced the venality of his subordinates by an open sale of offices; and the violent complaints of Procopius are confirmed by the legislative

1 *Cod. Theod.* viii. tit. 5, "De Cursu Publico."
2 *Cod. Just.* i. 55, 6, "De Defensoribus Civitatum"; 10, 75, "De Irenarchis;" ix. 17, 18, "De Pœnis."
3 Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxv. 12) shows that the provincial towns of Ostia and Ravenna had borrowed this Greek invention.

measures of the emperor.[1] When shame prevented the emperor himself from selling an official appointment, he did not blush to order the payment of a stated sum to be made to the empress Theodora.[2] This conduct opened a door to abuses on the part of the imperial ministers and provincial governors, and contributed, in no small degree, to the misfortunes of Justin II. It diminished the influence of the Roman administration in the distant provinces, and neutralised the benefits which Justinian had conferred on the empire by his legislative compilations. A strong proof of the declining condition of the Greek nation is to be found in the care with which every misfortune of this period is recorded in history. It is only when little hope is felt of repairing the ravages of disease, fire, and earthquakes, that these evils permanently affect the prosperity of nations. In an improving state of society, great as their ravages may prove, they are only personal misfortunes and temporary evils; the void which they create in the population is quickly replaced, and the property which they may destroy rises from its ruins with increased solidity and beauty. When it happens that a pestilence leaves a country depopulated for many generations, and that conflagrations and earthquakes ruin cities, which are never again reconstructed of their former size—these evils are apt to be mistaken by the people as the primary cause of the national decline, and acquire an undue historical importance in the popular mind. The age of Justinian was remarkable for a terrible pestilence which ravaged every province of the empire in succession, for many famines which swept away no inconsiderable portion of the population, and for earthquakes which laid waste no small number of the most flourishing and populous cities of the empire.[3]

Greece had suffered very little from hostile attacks after the departure of Alaric; for the piratical incursions of Genseric were neither very extensive nor very successful; and after the time of these barbarians, the ravages of earthquakes begin to figure in history, as an important cause of the impoverished and declining condition of the country. The Huns, it is true, extended their plundering expeditions, in the year 540, as far

[1] Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 14, 21. *Cod. Just.* i. 27, 1, 2, "De Officio Præfecti Prætorio Africæ." *Nov.* 8. *Nov.* 24. [2] *Nov.* 30, c. 6.

[3] Gibbon (ch. xliii.) gives an account of the earthquakes and of the great pestilence.—See notes 58, 60, 83 and 95. Procopius (*Goth.* ii. c. 17) gives a fearful picture of the famine in Italy, and says that millions perished in Africa, which suffered less than Italy.—*Hist. Arc.* c. 18.

as the Isthmus of Corinth, but they do not appear to have succeeded in capturing a single town of any note.[1] The fleet of Totila plundered Corcyra, and the coast of Epirus, from Nicopolis up to Dodona; but these misfortunes were temporary and partial, and could have caused no irreparable loss, either of life or property. The fact appears to be, that Greece was in a declining condition; but that the means of subsistence were abundant, and the population had but an incorrect and vague conception of the means by which the government was consuming their substance, and depopulating their country. In this state of things, several earthquakes, of singular violence, and attended by unusual phenomena, made a deep impression on men's minds, by producing a degree of desolation which a declining state of society rendered irreparable. Corinth, which was still a populous city, Patras, Naupactus, Chæronea, and Coronea, were all laid in ruins. An immense assembly of Greeks was collected at the time to celebrate a public festival; the whole population was swallowed up in the midst of their ceremonies. The waters of the Maliac Gulf retired suddenly, and left the shores of Thermopylæ dry; but the sea, suddenly returning with violence, swept up the valley of the Sperchius, and carried away the inhabitants. In an age of ignorance and superstition, when the prospects of mankind were despondent, and at the moment when the emperor was effacing the last relics of the religion of their ancestors—a religion which had filled the sea and the land with guardian deities—these awful occurrences could not fail to produce an alarming effect on men's minds, and were not unnaturally regarded as a supernatural confirmation of the despair which led many to imagine that the ruin of our globe was approaching. It is not wonderful that many pagans believed with Procopius that Justinian was the demon destined to complete the catastrophe of the human race.[2]

The condition of the Greek population in Achaia seems to have been as little understood by the courtiers of Justinian as that of the newly-established Greek kingdom by its Bavarian masters and the protecting powers. The splendid appearance which the ancient monuments, shining in the clear sky with the freshness of recent constructions, gave to the Greek cities, induced the Constantinopolitans and other strangers who visited the country, to suppose that the aspect of elegance and

[1] Procopius, *Pers.* ii. 4. [2] Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 18.

delicacy of finish, everywhere apparent, were the result of constant municipal expenditure. The buildings of Constantine and Theodosius in the capital were probably begrimed with dust and smoke, so that it was natural to conceive that those of Pericles and Epaminondas could retain a perpetual youth only by a liberal expenditure for their preservation. The celebrity of the city of Athens, the privileges which it still enjoyed, the society by which it was frequented as an agreeable residence, as a school for study, or as a place of retirement for the wealthy literary men of the age, gave the people of the capital a far too exalted idea of the well-being of Greece. The cotemporaries of Justinian judged the Greeks of their age by placing them in too close a relation with the inhabitants of the free states of antiquity; we, on the contrary, are too apt to confound them with the rude inhabitants who dwelt in the Peloponnesus after it was filled with Sclavonian and Albanian colonies. Had Procopius rightly estimated the condition of the rural population, and reflected on the extreme difficulty which the agriculturist always encounters in quitting his actual employment in order to seek any distant occupation, and the impossibility of finding money in a country where there are no purchasers for extra produce, he would not have signalised the penurious disposition of the Greeks as their national characteristic.[1] The population which spoke the Greek language in the capital and in the Roman administration was now influenced by a very different spirit from that of the inhabitants of the true Hellenic lands; and this separation of feeling became more and more conspicuous as the empire declined in power. The central administration soon ceased to pay any particular attention to Greece, which was sure to furnish its tribute, as it hated the Romans less than it feared the barbarians. From hence-forward, therefore, the inhabitants of Hellas become almost lost to the historians of the empire; and the motley and expatriated population of Constantinople, Asia Minor, Syria and Alexandria, is represented to the literary world as forming the real body of the Greek nation—an error which has con-

[1] *De Ædificiis*, iv. 11. "Ταύτη τε τῇ σμικρολογίᾳ." The historical works of Procopius were written for the literary classes, the *Secret History* for the people. It is probable that many works like the *Secret History*, circulated in the Lower Empire, were particularly addressed to Greek readers. Compare the unwillingness to blame the Greeks in c. 24 with the above passage in the *Ædificiis*. "Ἐπικλοῦνται τοῖς μὲν ὡς Γραικοὶ εἶεν, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐξὸν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τὸ παράπαν τινὶ γενναίῳ γενέσθαι."

cealed the history of a nation from our study, and replaced it by the annals of a court and the records of a government.

Section V

Influence of Justinian's conquests on the Greek population, and the change effected by the conquest of the Vandal kingdom of Africa

The attention of Justinian's immediate predecessors had been devoted to improving the internal condition of the empire, and that portion of the population of the Eastern Empire which spoke Greek forming the most important body of the emperor's subjects, it had participated in the greatest degree in this improvement. The Greeks were on the eve of securing a national preponderance in the Roman state, when Justinian forced them back into their former secondary condition, by directing the influence of the public administration to arms and law, the two departments of the Roman government from which the Greeks were in a great measure excluded. The conquests of Justinian, however, tended to improve the condition of the mercantile and manufacturing portion of the Greek population, by extending its commercial relations with the West; and the trading population of the East began to acquire an influence in public affairs, which tended to support the central government at Constantinople, when the framework of the Roman imperial administration began to give way in the provinces. With the exception of Sicily, and the southern portion of Italy, the whole of Justinian's conquests in the West were peopled by the Latin race; and the inhabitants, though attached to the imperial government of Constantinople as the political head of the orthodox church, were already opposed to the Greek nation.

When the Goths, Sueves, and Vandals had completed their establishments in Spain, Africa, and Italy, and their armies were spread over these countries as landed proprietors, the smallness of their number became apparent to the mass of the conquered population; and the barbarians soon lost in individual intercourse as citizens the superiority which they had enjoyed while united in armed bands. The Romans, in spite of the confiscation of a portion of their estates to enrich their conquerors, and in spite of the oppression with which they were treated, still formed the majority of the middle

classes; the administration of the greater part of the landed property, the commerce of the country, the municipal and judicial organisation, all centred in the hands of the Roman population. In addition to this political existence, they were separated from their conquerors by religion. The northern invaders of the Western Empire were Arians; the Roman population was orthodox. This religious feeling was so strong, that the Catholic king of the Franks, Clovis, was often able to avail himself of the assistance of the orthodox subjects of the Arian Goths, in his wars with the Gothic kings.[1] As soon, however, as Justinian proved that the Eastern Empire had recovered some portion of the ancient Roman vigour, the eyes of all the Roman population in Spain, Gaul, Africa, and Italy, were directed to the imperial court and there can be no doubt that the government of Justinian maintained extensive relations with the Roman population and the orthodox clergy over all Europe, to prepare for assisting his military operations.

Justinian had succeeded to the empire while it was embroiled in war with Persia, but he was fortunate enough to conclude a peace with Chosroes the Great, who ascended the Persian throne in the fourth year of his reign. In the East the emperor could never expect to make any permanent conquests; while in the West a large portion of the population of the countries which he proposed attacking was ready to receive his troops with open arms; and, in case of success, they were sure to form submissive and probably attached subjects. Both policy and religion induced Justinian to commence his attacks on the invaders of the Roman empire in Africa. The conquest of the northern coast of Africa by the Vandals, like the conquest of the other great provinces of the Western Empire by the Goths, the Burgundians, and the Franks, was gradually effected; for the number of Genseric's troops was too small to subdue and garrison the whole country in a series of consecutive campaigns. The Vandals, who quitted Spain in 428, could not arm more than 80,000 men. In the year 431, Genseric, having defeated Boniface, took Hippo; but it was not until 439 that he gained possession of Carthage; and the conquest of the whole African coast to the frontier of the Greek settlements in Cyrenaïca was not completed until after the death of Valentinian III., and the sack of Rome in 455. The Vandals were bigoted Arians, and their government was peculiarly

[1] *Gregory of Tours*, l. ii. c. 37.

tyrannical; they always treated the Roman inhabitants of Africa as political enemies, and persecuted them as religious opponents. The Visigoths in Spain had occupied two-thirds of the subjugated lands, the Ostrogoths in Italy had been satisfied with one-third; and both these people had acknowledged the civil rights of the Romans as citizens and Christians. The Vandals adopted a different policy. Genseric reserved immense domains to himself and to his sons. He divided the densely peopled and rich district of Africa proper among the Vandal warriors, exempting them from taxation, and binding them to military service. Eighty thousand lots were apportioned, clustered round the large possessions of the highest officers. They seized all the richest lands, and the most valuable estates, and exterminated the higher class of the Romans. Only the poorer proprietors were permitted to preserve the arid and distant parts of the country. Still the number of Romans excited the fears of the Vandals, who destroyed the walls of the provincial towns in order to prevent the people from receiving succours from the Eastern Empire, which might have supported a rebellion. The Roman population was enfeebled by these measures, but its hatred of the Vandal government was increased; and when Gelimer assumed the royal authority in the year 531, the people of Tripolis rebelled, and solicited assistance from Justinian.

Justinian could not overlook the great wealth of Africa at the time of its conquest by Genseric; the distributions of grain which it had furnished for Rome, and the immense tribute which it had once paid. Only a century had elapsed, so that he could hardly have supposed it possible that the wealth and population of the country had suffered to the extent of their actual diminution, from the oppressive government of the Vandal kings. On the other hand, he was doubtless perfectly aware of the neglected state of military discipline among the Vandals. The conquest of a civilised population by rude warriors must always be attended by the ruin, and often by the extermination, of the numerous classes which are supported by the profits of those manufactures which are destined for the consumption of the refined. The first conquerors despise the appearance and manners of the conquered, and never adopt immediately their costly dress, which is naturally considered as a sign of effeminacy and cowardice, nor do they adorn their dwellings with the same taste and refinement. The vanquished being deprived of the

wealth necessary to procure these luxuries, the ruin of a numerous class of manufacturers, and of a great portion of the industrious population, is an inevitable consequence of this cessation of demand. Thousands of artisans, tradesmen, and labourers, must either emigrate or perish by starvation; and the annihilation of a large commercial capital employed in supporting human life takes place with wonderful rapidity. Yet the conquerors may long live in wealth and luxury; the accumulated riches of the country will for many years be found amply sufficient to gratify all the desires of the victors, and the whole of this wealth will generally be consumed, and even the power of reproducing it be greatly diminished, before any signs of poverty are perceived by the conquerors. These facts are illustrated in the clearest manner by the history of the Vandal domination in Africa. The emigration of Vandal families from Spain did not consist of more than eighty thousand males of warlike age; and when Genseric conquered Carthage, his whole army amounted only to fifty thousand warriors; yet this small horde devoured all the wealth of Africa in the course of a single century, and, from an army of hardy soldiers, it was converted into a caste of luxurious nobles living in splendid villas round Carthage.[1] In order fully to understand the influence of the Vandals on the state of the country which they occupied, it must be observed that their oppressive government had already so far lowered the condition, and reduced the numbers of the Roman provincials, that the native Moors began to reoccupy the country from which Roman industry and Roman capital had excluded them. The Moorish population being in a lower state of civilisation than the lowest grade of the Romans, could exist in districts abandoned as uninhabitable after the destruction of buildings and plantations which the oppressed farmer had no means of replacing; and thus, from the time of the Vandal invasion, we find the Moors continually gaining ground on the Latin colonists, gradually covering an increased extent of country, and augmenting in numbers and power. As the property of the province was destroyed, its Roman inhabitants perished.

When Justinian attacked the Vandals they had become one of the most luxurious nations in the world: but as they continued to affect the character of soldiers, they were admirably armed, and ready to take the field with their whole male population. The neglect of military discipline and science

[1] Procopius, *Vand.* i. c. 5.

rendered their armies very inefficient in spite of their splendid equipments. Hilderic, the fifth monarch of the Vandal kingdom, the grandson of Genseric, and son of Eudocia, the daughter of the emperor Valentinian III., showed himself inclined to protect his orthodox and Roman subjects.[1] This disposition, and his Roman descent, excited the suspicion of his Vandal and Arian countrymen, without attaching the orthodox provincials to his hated race. Gelimer, the great-grandson of Genseric, availed himself of the general discontent to dethrone Hilderic, but the revolution was not effected without manifestations of dissatisfaction. The Roman inhabitants of the province of Tripolis availed themselves of the opportunity to throw off the Vandal yoke, and solicit assistance from Justinian; and a Gothic officer who commanded in Sardinia rebelled against the usurper.

The treason of Gelimer afforded Justinian an excellent pretext for invading the Vandal kingdom. Belisarius, a general already distinguished by his conduct in the Persian war, was selected to command an expedition of considerable magnitude, though by no means equal to the great expedition which Leo I. had sent to attack Genseric.[2] Ten thousand infantry, and five thousand cavalry, were embarked in a fleet of five hundred transports, which was protected and escorted by ninety-two light galleys of war. The troops were all veterans, inured to discipline, and the cavalry was composed of the choicest soldiers in the imperial service. After a long navigation, and some delay at Methone and in Sicily, they reached Africa. The Vandals, who, in the time of Genseric, had been redoubted pirates, and as such were national enemies of the commercial Greeks, were now too wealthy to court danger, and were ignorant of the approach of the Roman armament, until they received the news that Belisarius was marching towards Carthage. They were numerous, and doubtless brave, but they were no longer trained to war, or accustomed to regular discipline, and their behaviour in the field of battle was contemptible. Two engagements of cavalry,

[1] The succession of the Vandal monarchs was as follows :—

They invaded Africa	A.D. 428
Genseric ascended the throne	429
Hunneric	477
Gundamund	484
Thorismund	496
Hilderic	523
Gelimer seized the crown	531

[2] See page 183.

in the bloodiest of which the Vandals lost only eight hundred men, decided the fate of Africa, and enabled Belisarius to subjugate the Vandal kingdom. The brothers of Gelimer fell gallantly in the field. His own behaviour renders even his personal courage doubtful,—he fled to the Moors of the mountainous districts; but the misery of barbarous warfare, and the privations of a besieged camp, soon extinguished his feelings of pride, and his love of independence. Belisarius led him prisoner to Constantinople, where he appeared in the pageantry of a triumphal procession. A conquering general, a captive monarch, and a Roman triumph, offered strong temptations to romantic fancies; but we are informed by Procopius that Gelimer received from Justinian large estates in Galatia, to which he retired with his relations. Justinian offered him the rank of patrician, and a seat in the senate; but he was attached to his Arian principles, and believing that his personal dignity would be best maintained by avoiding to appear in a crowd of servile senators, he refused to join the orthodox church.[1]

The Vandals displayed as little patriotism and fortitude as their king. Some were slain in the war, the rest were incorporated in the Roman armies, or escaped to the Moors. The provincials were allowed to reclaim the lands from which they had been expelled at the conquest; the Arian heresy was proscribed, and the race of these remarkable conquerors was in a short time exterminated. A single generation sufficed to confound their women and children in the mass of the Roman inhabitants of the province, and their very name was totally forgotten. There are few instances in history of a nation disappearing so rapidly and so completely as the Vandals of Africa. After their conquest by Belisarius, they vanish from the face of the earth as completely as the Carthaginians after the taking of Carthage by Scipio. Their first monarch, Genseric, had been powerful enough to plunder both Rome and Greece, yet his army hardly exceeded fifty thousand men. His successors, who held the absolute sovereignty of Africa for one hundred and seven years, do not appear to have commanded a larger force. The whole Vandals seem never to have multiplied beyond the oligarchical position in which their sudden acquisition of immense wealth had placed them.[2]

[1] Procopius, *Vand.* ii. c. 9.

[2] The Vandal domination in Spain has left a permanent memorial in the name of Andalusia from Vindelicia.

Belisarius soon established the Roman authority so firmly round Carthage, that he was able to despatch troops in every direction, in order to secure and extend his conquests. The western coast was subjected as far as the Straits of Hercules: a garrison was placed in Septum, and a body of troops stationed in Tripolis, to secure the eastern part of this extensive province from the incursions of the Moors. Sardinia, Corsica, Majorca, Minorca, and Iviça, were added to the empire merely by sending officers to take the command of these islands, and troops to form the garrisons. The commercial relations of the Greeks, and the civil institutions of the Romans, still exercised a very powerful influence over the populations of these islands.

Justinian determined to re-establish the Roman government on precisely the same basis as it existed before the Vandal invasion; but as the registers of the land-tax and capitation, and the official admeasurement of the estates, no longer existed, officers were sent from Constantinople for the assessment of the taxes; and the old principle of extorting as much of the surplus produce of the land as possible, was adopted as the rule for apportioning the tribute. Yet, in the opinion of the provincials, the financial rapacity of the imperial government was a more tolerable evil than the tyranny of the Vandals, and they remained long sincerely attached to the Roman power. Unfortunately, the rebellion of the barbarian mercenaries, who formed the flower of Justinian's army in Africa, the despair of the persecuted Arians, the seductions of the Vandal women, and the hostile incursions of the Moorish tribes, aided the severity of the taxes in desolating this flourishing province. The exclusion of the Roman population from the right of bearing arms, and forming themselves into a local militia, even for the protection of their property against the plundering expeditions of the neighbouring barbarians, prevented the African provincials from aspiring after independence, and rendered them incapable of defending their property without the aid of the experienced though disorderly soldiery of the imperial armies. Religious persecution, financial oppression, the seditions of unpaid troops, and the incursions of barbarous tribes, though they failed to cause a general insurrection of the inhabitants, ruined their wealth, and lessened their numbers. Procopius records the commencement of the desolation of Africa in his time; and subsequently, as the imperial government grew weaker, more negligent, and more corrupt, it

pressed more heavily on the industry and well-being of the provincials, and enabled the barbarous Moors to extend their encroachments on Roman civilisation.[1]

The glory of Belisarius deserves to be contrasted with the oblivion which has covered the exploits of John the Patrician, one of the ablest generals of Justinian. This experienced general assumed the command in Africa when the province had fallen into a state of great disorder; the inhabitants were exposed to a dangerous coalition of the Moors, and the Roman army was in such a state of destitution that their leader was compelled to import the necessary provisions for his troops.[2] Though John defeated the Moors, and restored prosperity to the province, his name is almost forgotten. His actions and talents only affected the interests of the Byzantine empire, and prolonged the existence of the Roman province of Africa; they exerted no influence on the fate of any of the European nations whose history has been the object of study in modern times, so that they were utterly forgotten, when the recently discovered poetry of Corippus, one of the last and worst of the Roman poets, rescued them from complete oblivion.

Section VI

Causes of the easy conquest of the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy by Belisarius

The empire of the Ostrogoths, though established on principles of a just administration by the wisdom of the great Theodoric, soon began to suffer as complete a national demoralisation as that of the Vandals, though the Goths themselves, from being more civilised, and living more directly under the restraint of laws which protected the property of their Roman subjects, had not become individually so corrupted by the possession of wealth. The conquest of Italy had not produced any very great revolution in the state of the country. The Romans had long been accustomed to be defended in name, but, in fact, to be ruled, by the commanders of the mercenary troops in the emperor's service. The Goths, even after the conquest, allowed them to retain two-thirds of their landed estates, with all their movable property; and as they had really been as completely excluded from military

[1] Procopius, *De Bello Vand.* ii. 14–28; *Hist. Arc.* 18. Corippus, *Johannides.*
[2] Corippus, *Johannides*, v. 384.

service under their own emperors, their social condition underwent but little change.[1] Policy induced Theodoric to treat the inhabitants of Italy with mildness. The permanent maintenance of his conquests required a considerable revenue, and that revenue could only be supplied by the industry and civilisation of his Italian subjects. His sagacity told him that it was wiser to tax the Romans than to plunder them, and that it was necessary, in order to secure the fruits of a regular system of taxation, to leave them in the possession of those laws and privileges which enabled them to defend their civilisation. It is singular that the empire of Theodoric, the most extensive and most celebrated of those which were formed by the conquerors of the Roman provinces, should have proved the least durable. The justice of Theodoric, and the barbarity of Genseric, were equally ineffectual in consolidating a permanent dominion. The civilisation of the Romans was more powerful than the mightiest of the barbarian monarchs; and until that civilisation had sunk nearly to the level of their conquerors, the institutions of the Romans were always victorious over the national strength of the barbarians. Under Theodoric, Italy was still Roman. The senate of Rome, the municipal councils of the other cities, the old courts of law, the parties of the circus, the factions in the church, and even the titles and the pensions attached to nominal offices in the State, all still existed unchanged; men still fought with wild beasts in the Coliseum.[2] The orthodox Roman lived under his own law, with his own clergy, and the Arian Goth only enjoyed equal liberty. The powerful and the wealthy, whether they were Romans or Goths, were equally sure of obtaining justice; the poor, whether Goths or Romans, were in equal danger of being oppressed.[3]

[1] Odoacer and Theodoric divided amongst their followers one-third of the Roman estates in Italy.—Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* i. c. 1. For an account of the Ostrogothic government of Italy, see *Essai sur l'état, civil et politique, des Peuples d'Italie sous le gouvernement des Goths*, par Sartorius, Paris, 1811; and *Geschichte des Ost-Gothischen Reichs in Italien*, Von Manso, Breslau, 1824. It is remarkable that the barbarians, on establishing themselves in Italy, adopted the ancient Roman usage of appropriating a third of the conquered lands. This resemblance to the old Roman colonies cannot have been accidental in a people who imitated so much of the laws of Rome in their territorial administration. The Goths constituted themselves the military defenders of the unarmed tax-payers, and both as such, and as the conquerors of the country, they could claim under the Roman laws all the privileges which Augustus had bestowed on his colonies of veterans. The Romans at last suffered the evils they had inflicted on others. That Romans served in the Gothic armies, though the case may have been rare, appears from the passages pointed out by Sartorius.—P. 248.

[2] Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 24, 26. Manso (p. 140) observes that Theodoric only tolerated the shows of the amphitheatre, of which he disapproved. Cassiodorus, *Variæ*, v. 42.

[3] Theodoric says, in his edict, "Quod si forsitan persona potentior, aut ejus pro-

The kingdom which the great Theodoric left to his grandson Athalaric, under the guardianship of his daughter Amalasonta, embraced not only Italy, Sicily, and a portion of the south of France; it also included Dalmatia, a part of Illyricum, Pannonia, Noricum, and Rhætia. In these extensive dominions, the Gothic race formed but a small part of the population; and yet the Goths, from the privileges which they enjoyed, were everywhere regarded with jealousy by the bulk of the inhabitants. Dissensions arose in the royal family; Athalaric died young; Amalasonta was murdered by Theodatus, his successor; and as she had been in constant communication with the court of Constantinople, this crime afforded Justinian a decent pretext for interfering in the affairs of the Goths. To prepare the way for the reconquest of Italy, Belisarius was sent to attack Sicily, which he invaded with an army of seven thousand five hundred men, in the year 535, and subjected without difficulty. During the same campaign, Dalmatia was conquered by the imperial arms, recovered by the Goths, but again reconquered by Justinian's troops. A rebellion of the troops in Africa arrested, for a while, the progress of Belisarius, and compelled him to visit Carthage; but he returned to Sicily in a short time, and crossing over to Rhegium, marched directly to Naples. As he proceeded, he was everywhere welcomed by the inhabitants, who were then almost universally Greeks; even the Gothic commander in the south of Italy favoured the progress of the Roman general.[1]

The city of Naples made a vigorous defence; but after a siege of three weeks it was taken by introducing into the place a body of troops through the passage of an ancient aqueduct. The conduct of Belisarius, after the capture of the city, was dictated by policy, and displayed very little humanity. As the inhabitants had shown some disposition to assist the Gothic garrison in defending the city, and as such conduct would

curator, vel vicedominus ipsius, aut certe conductor seu barbari, seu Romani, in aliquo genere causæ præsentia non permiserint edicta servari," etc. Sartorius, 284. A great improvement took place in the condition of the rural population of Italy during the thirty years' reign of Theodoric. A considerable part of the land previously in pasturage was restored to agriculture, in consequence of the grain trade being left free by the cessation of distributions and maximum of market prices. Italy again began to produce enough for its own consumption. This change led to the formation of a free class of cultivators of the soil—Romans, who farmed the landed estates of the Gothic warriors.

[1] Evermor, or Eurimond (for Jornandes gives him one name in his History of the Goths, and another in his Chronicle), was the son-in-law of the King Theodatus, yet he joined Belisarius. The Romans had a party among the Goths; and, after the conquest, many Goths were converted from Arians to Catholics. Jornandes speaks of himself: "Ego item, quamvis agrammatus, Jornandes, ante conversionem meam notarius fui." This, however, implies perhaps that he had embraced the clerical life. His Roman attachments are strongly shown in his works.—*De Rebus Geticis*, p. 382.

have greatly increased the difficulty of his campaign in Italy, in order to intimidate the population of other cities he appears to have winked at the pillage of the town, to have tolerated the massacre of many of the citizens in the churches, where they had sought an asylum, and to have overlooked a sedition of the lowest populace, in which the leaders of the Gothic party were assassinated. From Naples, Belisarius marched forward to Rome.

Only sixty years had elapsed since Rome had been conquered by Odoacer; and during this period its population, the ecclesiastical and civil authority of its bishop, who was the highest dignitary in the Christian world, and the influence of its senate, which still continued to be in the eyes of mankind the most honourable political body in existence, enabled it to preserve a species of independent civic constitution. Theodoric had availed himself of this municipal government to smooth away many of the difficulties which presented themselves in the administration of Italy. The Goths, however, in leaving the Romans in possession of their own civil laws and institutions, had not diminished their aversion to a foreign yoke; yet as they possessed no distinct feelings of nationality apart from their connection with the imperial domination and their religious orthodoxy, they never aspired to independence, and were content to turn their eyes towards the emperor of the East as their legitimate sovereign. Belisarius, therefore, entered the "Eternal City" rather as a friend than as a conqueror; but he had hardly entered it before he perceived that it would be necessary to take every precaution to defend his conquest against the new Gothic king Witiges. He immediately repaired the walls of Rome, strengthened them with a breastwork, collected large stores of provisions, and prepared to sustain a siege.

The Gothic war forms an important epoch in the history of the city of Rome; for, within the space of sixteen years, it changed masters five times, and suffered three severe sieges.[1] Its population was almost destroyed; its public buildings and its walls must have undergone many changes, according to the exigencies of the various measures required for its defence.

1 Rome was taken by Belisarius . . . A.D. 536
Besieged by Witiges . . . 537
Besieged and taken by Totila . . . 546
Retaken by Belisarius . . . 547
Again besieged and retaken by Totila . . . 549
Taken by Narses . . . 552
—Clinton, *Fasti Romani.*

It has, consequently, been too generally assumed that the existing walls indicate the exact position of those of Aurelian. This period is also memorable for the ruin of many monuments of ancient art, which the generals of Justinian destroyed without compunction. With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defence against Witiges commences the history of the middle ages,—of the times of destruction and of change.[1]

Witiges laid siege to Rome with an army said by Procopius to have amounted to 150,000 men, yet this army was insufficient to invest the whole circuit of the city.[2] The Gothic king distributed his troops in seven fortified camps; six were formed to surround the city, and the seventh was placed to protect the Milvian bridge. Five camps covered the space from the Prenestine to the Flaminian gates, and the remaining camp was formed beyond the Tiber, in the plain below the Vatican. By these arrangements the Goths only commanded about half the circuit of Rome, and the roads to Naples and to the ports at the mouth of the Tiber remained open. The Roman infantry was now the weakest part of a Roman army. Even in the defence of a fortified city it was subordinate to the cavalry, and the military superiority of the Roman arms was sustained by mercenary horsemen. It is strange to find the tactics of the middle ages described by Procopius in classic Greek. The Goths displayed an utter ignorance of the art of war; they had no skill in the use of military engines, and they could not even render their numerical superiority available in assaults. The leading operations of the attack and defence of Rome consisted in a series of cavalry engagements fought under its walls; and in these the superior discipline and skill of the mercenaries of Belisarius generally secured them the victory. The Roman cavalry, —for so the mixture of Huns, Heruls, and Armenians which

[1] **Honorius made changes and repairs in the walls. Theodoric repaired them.** Cassiodorus, *Var.* i. ep. 25, 11; ep. 34. Belisarius found them in a ruinous state, the ditch filled up in some places. In general the sieges during the Gothic War required the reduction of the size of the place, where this was practicable. The feebleness of the outer wall of the Vivarium indicates that this was not the original external wall. Totila destroyed about one-third of the wall of Rome. Procop. *Goth.* iii. 22. Marcell. *Chron. ap. Sermond.* ii. 385. Belisarius must have made changes in repairing this destruction; and Diogenes, who defended Rome against Totila in 548, could hardly fail to do so. Totila added to the walls near the Mole of Adrian.—Procop. *Goth.* iii. 36; iv. 33. The whole defences must have been remodelled by Narses, as they then consisted in great part of temporary works and hasty repairs.—*De Roma eiusque Muris atque Portis.* Scripsit G. A. Becker, Prof. Lips.; Leipsic, 1842. Pope Gregory II. began to repair the walls from the gate of St. Lawrence.—Anastasius, *Bibl.*, "De Vitis Pont. Roman." 67; edit. Ven.

[2] *De Bello Goth.* i. 14.

formed the élite of the army must be termed,—trusted chiefly to the bow; while the Goths placed their reliance on the lance and sword, which the able manœuvres of their enemies seldom allowed them to use with effect. The infantry of both armies usually remained idle spectators of the combat. Belisarius himself considered it of little use in a field of battle; and when he once reluctantly admitted it, at the pressing solicitation of its commanders, to share in one of his engagements, its defeat, after the exhibition of great bravery on the part both of the officers and men, confirmed him in his preference of the cavalry.

In spite of the prudent arrangements adopted by Belisarius to insure supplies of provisions from his recent conquests in Sicily and Africa, Rome suffered very severely from famine during the siege; but the Gothic army was compelled to undergo equal hardships, and suffered far greater losses from disease. The communications of the garrison with the coast were for a time interrupted, but at last a body of five thousand fresh troops, and an abundant supply of provisions, despatched by Justinian to the assistance of Belisarius, entered Rome. Shortly after the arrival of this reinforcement, the Goths found themselves constrained to abandon the siege, in which they had persevered for a year. Justinian again augmented his army in Italy, by sending over seven thousand troops under the command of the eunuch Narses, a man whose military talents were in no way inferior to those of Belisarius, and whose name occupies an equally important place in the history of Italy. The emperor, guided by the prudent jealousy which dictated the strictest control over all the powerful generals of the empire, had conferred on Narses an independent authority over his own division, and that general, presuming too far on his knowledge of Justinian's feelings, ventured to throw serious obstacles in the way of Belisarius. The dissensions of the two generals delayed the progress of the Roman arms. The Goths availed themselves of the opportunity to continue the war with vigour; they succeeded in reconquering Milan, which had admitted a Roman garrison, and sacked the city, which was second only to Rome in wealth and population. They massacred the whole male population, and behaved with such cruelty that three hundred thousand persons were said to have perished—a number which probably only indicates the whole population of Milan at this period.[1]

[1] Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* ii. 21. A.D. 539.

A state of warfare soon disorganised the ill-cemented government of the Gothic kingdom; and the ravages caused by the wide-extended military operations of the armies, which degenerated into a succession of sieges and skirmishes, created a dreadful famine in the north of Italy. Whole provinces remained uncultivated; great numbers of the industrious natives perished by actual starvation, and the ranks of the Goths were thinned by misery and disease. Society advanced one step towards barbarism. Procopius, who was himself in Italy at the time, records a horrible story of two women who lived on human flesh, and were discovered to have murdered seventeen persons, in order to devour their bodies.[1] This famine assisted the progress of the Roman arms, as the imperial troops drew their supplies of provisions from the East, while the measures of their enemies were paralysed by the general want.

Witiges, finding his resources inadequate to check the conquests of Belisarius, solicited the aid of the Franks, and despatched an embassy to Chosroes to excite the jealousy of the Persian monarch. The Franks, under Theodebert, entered Italy, but they were soon compelled to retire; and Belisarius, being placed at the head of the whole army by the recall of Narses, soon terminated the war. Ravenna, the Gothic capital, was invested; but the siege was more remarkable for the negotiations which were carried on during its progress than for the military operations. The Goths, with the consent of Witiges, made Belisarius the singular offer of acknowledging him as the Emperor of the West, on condition of his joining his forces to theirs, permitting them to retain their position and property in Italy, and thus insuring them the possession of their nationality and their peculiar laws. Perhaps neither the state of the mercenary army which he commanded, nor the condition of the Gothic nation, rendered the project very feasible. It is certain that Belisarius only listened to it, in order to hasten the surrender of Ravenna, and secure the person of Witiges without farther bloodshed. Italy submitted to Justinian, and the few Goths who still maintained their independence beyond the Po pressed Belisarius in vain to declare himself emperor. But even without these solicitations, his power had awakened the fears of his sovereign, and he was recalled, though with honour, from his command in Italy. He returned to Constantinople leading Witiges captive, as he had formerly appeared conducting Gelimer.

[1] *De Bello Gotth.* ii. 30.

Great as the talents of Belisarius really were, and sound as his judgment appears to have been, still it must be confessed that his name occupies a more prominent place in history than his merits are entitled to claim. The accident that his conquests put an end to two powerful monarchies, of his having led captive to Constantinople the representatives of the dreaded Genseric and the great Theodoric, joined with the circumstance that he enjoyed the singular good fortune of having his exploits recorded in the classic language of Procopius, the last historian of the Greeks, have rendered a brilliant career more brilliant from the medium through which it is seen. At the same time the tale of his blindness and poverty has extended a sympathy with his misfortunes into circles which would have remained indifferent to the real events of his history, and made his name an expression for heroic greatness reduced to abject misery by royal ingratitude. But Belisarius, though he refused the Gothic throne and the empire of the West, did not despise nor neglect wealth; he accumulated riches which could not have been acquired by any commander-in-chief amidst the wars and famines of the period, without rendering the military and civil administration subservient to his pecuniary profit. On his return from Italy he lived at Constantinople in almost regal splendour, and maintained a body of seven thousand cavalry attached to his household.[1] In an empire where confiscation was an ordinary financial resource, and under a sovereign whose situation rendered jealousy only common prudence, it is not surprising that the wealth of Belisarius excited the imperial cupidity, and induced Justinian to seize great part of it. His fortune was twice reduced by confiscations. The behaviour of the general under his misfortunes, and the lamentable picture of his depression which Procopius has drawn, when he lost a portion of his wealth on his first disgrace, does not tend to elevate his character. At a later period his wealth was again confiscated on an accusation of treason, and on this occasion it is said that he was deprived of his sight, and reduced to such a state of destitution that he begged his bread in a public square, soliciting charity with the exclamation, "Give Belisarius an obolus!" But ancient historians were ignorant of this fable, which has been rejected by every modern authority in Byzantine history. Justinian, on calm reflection, disbelieved the treason imputed to a man who, in his younger days, had refused to ascend a throne; or else he

[1] Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iii. 1.

pardoned what he supposed to be the error of a general t whose services he was so deeply indebted; and Belisariu reinstated in some part of his fortune, died in possession c wealth and honour.[1]

Belisarius had hardly quitted Italy when the Goths re assembled their forces. They were accustomed to rule, an nourished in the profession of arms. Justinian sent a civiliar Alexander the logothete, to govern Italy, hoping that hi financial arrangements would render the new conquest source of revenue to the imperial treasury. The fiscal admini stration of the new governor soon excited great discontent He diminished the number of the Roman troops, and put stop to those profits which a state of war usually affords th military; while at the same time, he abolished the pension and privileges which formed no inconsiderable portion of the revenue of the higher classes, and which had never beer entirely suppressed during the Gothic domination. Alexande may have acted in some cases with undue severity in enfor cing these measures; but it is evident, from their nature, tha he must have received express orders to put an end to what Justinian considered the lavish expenditure of Belisarius.

A part of the Goths in the north of Italy retained their independence after the surrender of Witiges. They raised Hildibald to the throne, which he occupied about a year, when he was murdered by one of his own guards. The tribe of Rugians then raised Erarich their leader to the throne: but on his entering into negotiations with the Romans he was murdered, after a reign of only five months. Totila was then elected king of the Goths, and had he not been opposed to the greatest men whom the declining age of the Roman empire produced, he would probably have succeeded in restoring the Gothic monarchy in Italy.[2] His successes endeared him to his countrymen, while the justice of his administration contrasted with the rapacity of Justinian's government, and gained him the respect and submission of the native provincials. He was on the point of commencing the siege of Rome, when

[1] See Appendix No. 1. On the Blindness of Belisarius.

[2] Chronology of the Kings of the Ostrogoths.

	A.D.		A.D.
Theodoric	493–526	Hildibald	540–541
Athalaric	526–534	Erarich	541–541
Amalasontha.		Totila[3]	541–552
Theodatus	534–536	Theias	552–553
Witiges	536–540		

[3] Totila is named Baduila on his coins.

Belisarius, who, after his departure from Ravenna, had been employed in the Persian war, was sent back to Italy to recover the ground already lost. The imperial forces were completely destitute of that unity and military organisation which constitute a number of different corps into one army. The various bodies of troops were commanded by officers completely independent of one another, and obedient only to Belisarius as commander-in-chief. Justinian, acting on his usual maxims of jealousy, and distrusting Belisarius more than formerly, had retained the greater part of his body-guard, and all his veteran followers, at Constantinople; so that he now appeared in Italy unaccompanied by a staff of scientific officers and a body of veteran troops on whose experience and discipline he could rely for implicit obedience to his orders. The heterogeneous elements of which his army was composed made all combined operations impracticable, and his position was rendered still more disadvantageous by the change that had taken place in that of his enemy. Totila was now able to command every sacrifice on the part of his followers, for the Goths, taught by their misfortunes, and deprived of their wealth, felt the importance of union and discipline, and paid the strictest attention to the orders of their sovereign. The Gothic king laid siege to Rome, and Belisarius established himself in Porto, at the mouth of the Tiber; but all his endeavours to relieve the besieged city proved unsuccessful, and Totila compelled it to surrender under his eye, and in spite of all his exertions.

The national and religious feelings of the orthodox Romans rendered them the irreconcilable enemies of the Arian Goths. Totila soon perceived that it would not be in his power to defend Rome against a scientific enemy and a hostile population, in consequence of the great extent of the fortifications, and the impossibility of dislodging the imperial troops from the forts at the mouth of the Tiber. But he also perceived that the Eastern emperors would be unable to maintain a footing in central Italy without the support of the Roman population, whose industrial, commercial, aristocratic, and ecclesiastical influence was concentrated in the city population of Rome. He therefore determined to destroy the "Eternal City," and if policy authorise kings on great occasions to trample on the precepts of humanity, the king of the Goths might claim a right to destroy the race of the Romans. Even the statesman may still doubt whether the decision of Totila, if it had been carried into execution in the most

merciless manner, would not have purified the moral atmosphere of Italian society. He commenced the destruction of the walls; but either the difficulty of completing his project or the feelings of humanity which were inseparable from his enlightened ambition, induced him to listen to the representations of Belisarius, who conjured him to abandon his barbarous scheme of devastation.[1] Totila, nevertheless, did everything in his power to depopulate Rome; he compelled the inhabitants to retire into the Campania, and forced the senators to abandon their native city. It is to this emigration that the utter extinction of the old Roman race and civic government must be attributed; for when Belisarius, and, at a later period, Totila himself, attempted to repeople Rome, they laid the foundations of a new society, which connects itself rather with the history of the middle ages than with that of preceding times.

Belisarius entered the city after the departure of the Goths; and as he found it deserted, he had the greatest difficulty in putting it in a state of defence. But though Belisarius was enabled, by his military skill, to defend Rome against the attacks of Totila, he was unable to make any head against the Gothic army in the open field; and after vainly endeavouring to bring back victory to the Roman standards in Italy, he received permission to resign the command and return to Constantinople. His want of success must be attributed solely to the inadequacy of the means placed at his disposal for encountering an active and able sovereign like Totila. The unpopularity of his second administration in Italy arose from the neglect of Justinian in paying the troops, and the necessity which that irregularity imposed on their commander, of levying heavy contributions on the Italians, while it rendered the task of enforcing strict discipline, and of protecting the property of the people from the ill-paid soldiery, quite impracticable. Justice, however, requires that we should not omit to mention that Belisarius, though he returned to Constantinople with diminished glory, did not neglect his pecuniary interests, and came back without any diminution of his wealth.

As soon as Totila was freed from the restraint imposed on his movements by the fear of Belisarius, he quickly recovered Rome; and the loss of Italy appeared inevitable,

[1] As far as a feeling for ancient art was concerned, it may be doubted whether Belisarius had more taste than Totila for classic purity.

when Justinian decided on making a new effort to retain it. As it was necessary to send a large army against the Goths, and invest the commander-in-chief with great powers, it is not probable that Justinian would have trusted any other of his generals more than Belisarius had he not fortunately possessed in able officer, the eunuch Narses, who could never rebel with the hope of placing the imperial crown on his own head. The assurance of his fidelity gave Narses great influence in the interior of the palace, and secured him a support which would never have been conceded to any other general. His military talents, and his freedom from the reproach of avarice or peculation, augmented his personal influence, and his diligence and liberality soon assembled a powerful army. The choicest mercenary troops—Huns, Heruls, Armenians, and Lombards — marched under his standard with the veteran Roman soldiers. The first object of Narses after his arrival in Italy was to force the Goths to risk a general engagement, trusting to the excellence of his troops, and to his own skill in the employment of their superior discipline. The rival armies met at Tagina, near Nocera, and the victory of Narses was complete.[1] Totila and six thousand Goths perished, and Rome again fell under the dominion of Justinian. At the solicitation of the Goths, an army of Franks and Germans was permitted by Theobald, king of Austrasia, to enter Italy for the purpose of making a diversion in their favour.[2] Bucelin, the leader of this army, was met by Narses on the banks of the Casilinus, near Capua. The forces of the Franks consisted of thirty thousand men, those of the Romans did not exceed eighteen thousand, but the victory of Narses was so complete that but few of the former escaped. The remaining Goths elected another king, Theïas, who perished with his army near the banks of the Sarno. His death put an end to the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, and allowed Narses to turn his whole attention to the civil government of his conquests, and to establish security of property and a strict administration of justice. He appears to have been a man singularly well adapted to his situation—possessing the highest military talents, combined with a perfect knowledge of the civil and financial administration; and he was consequently able to estimate with exactness the sum which he could levy on the province, and remit to Constantinople, without arresting the

1 Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xliii. note 34.
2 Theobald reigned from A.D. 548 to 555.

gradual improvement of the country. His fiscal government was, nevertheless, regarded by the Italians as extremely severe and he was unpopular with the inhabitants of Rome.

The existence of a numerous Roman population in Spain connected with the Eastern Empire by the memory of ancient ties, by active commercial relations, and by a strong orthodox feeling against the Arian Visigoths, enabled Justinian to avail himself of these advantages in the same manner as he had done in Africa and Italy. The king Theudes had attempted to make a diversion in Africa by besieging Ceuta, in order to call off the attention of Justinian from Italy. His attack was unsuccessful, but the circumstances were not favourable at the time for Justinian's attempting to revenge the injury.[1] Dissensions in the country soon after enabled the emperor to take part in a civil war, and he seized the pretext of sending a fleet and troops to support the claims of a rebel chief, in order to secure the possession of a large portion of the south of Spain.[2] The rebel Athanagild having been elected king of the Visigoths, vainly endeavoured to drive the Romans out of the provinces which they had occupied. Subsequent victories extended the conquests of Justinian from the mouth of the Tagus, Ebora, and Corduva, along the coast of the ocean, and of the Mediterranean, almost as far as Valentia; and at times the relations of the Romans with the Catholic population of the interior enabled them to carry their arms almost into the centre of Spain.[3] The Eastern Empire retained possession of these distant conquests for about sixty years.

Section VII

Relations of the Northern Nations with the Roman Empire and the Greek Nation

The reign of Justinian witnessed the total decline of the power of the Gothic race on the banks of the Danube, where a void was created in the population which neither the Huns nor the Sclavonians could fill. The consequence was that new races of barbarians from the East poured into the countries between the Black Sea and the Carinthian Alps;

[1] A.D. 545. Procop. *De Bello Gotth.* ii. c. 30.

[2] Agila was elected king A.D. 549; he was murdered, and the rebel Athanagild elected in 554.

[3] Aschbach, *Geschichte der Westgothen*, p. 192. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, ix. 306,—Saint Martin's notes.

and the military aristocracy of the Goths, whose social arrangements conformed to the system of the ancient world, was succeeded by the ruder domination of nomade tribes. The causes of this change are to be found in the same great principle which was modifying the position of the various races of mankind in every region of the earth; and by the destruction of all the elements of civilisation in the country immediately to the south of the Danube, in consequence of the repeated ravages to which it had been exposed; and in the impossibility of any agricultural population, not sunk very low in the scale of civil society, finding the means of subsistence where villages, farm-houses, and barns were in ruins; where the fruit trees were cut down; where the vineyards were destroyed, and the cattle required for cultivating the land were carried off. The Goths, who had once ruled all the country from the Lake Mæotis to the Adriatic, and who were the most civilised of all the invaders of the Roman empire, were the first to disappear. Only a single tribe, called the Tetraxits, continued to inhabit their old seats in the Tauric Chersonese, where some of their descendants survived until the sixteenth century.[1] The Gepids, a kindred people, had defeated the Huns, and established their independence after the death of Attila.[2] They obtained from Marcian the cession of a considerable district on the banks of the Danube, and an annual subsidy in order to secure their alliance in defending the frontier of the empire against other invaders. In the reign of Justinian their possessions were reduced to the territories lying between the Save and the Drave, but the alliance with the Roman empire continued in force, and they still received their subsidy.

The Heruls, a people whose connection with Scandinavia is mentioned by Procopius,[3] and who took part in some of the earliest incursions of the Gothic tribes into the empire, had, after many vicissitudes, obtained from the emperor Anastasius a fixed settlement; and in the time of Justinian they possessed the country to the south of the Save, and occupied the city of Singidunum (Belgrade). The Lombards, a Germanic people, who had once been subject to the Heruls, but who had subsequently defeated their masters, and driven them within the bounds of the empire for protection, were induced by Justinian to invade the Ostrogothic kingdom, and establish themselves

1 Busbequius, *Epist.* iv. p. 321; edit. Elz. 1669. Gibbon. ch. xl. note 126.
2 Jornandes, *De Rebus Geticis*, xvii. 3 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* ii. 15.

in Pannonia, to the north of the Drave. They occupied the country between the Danube and the Teisse, and, like their neighbours, received an annual subsidy from the Eastern Empire.[1] These Gothic nations never formed the bulk of the population in the lands which they occupied; they were only the lords of the soil, who knew no occupations but those of war and hunting. But their successes in war, and the subsidies by which they had been enriched, had accustomed them to a degree of rude magnificence which became constantly of more difficult attainment, as their own oppressive government and the ravages of their more barbarous neighbours, depopulated all the regions around their settlements. When they became, like the other northern conquerors, a territorial aristocracy, they suffered the fate of all privileged classes which are separated from the mass of the people. Their luxury increased, and their numbers diminished. At the same time, incessant wars and ravages of territory swept away the unarmed population, so that the conquerors were at last compelled to abandon these possessions to seek richer seats, as the Indians of the American continent quit the lands where they have destroyed the wild game, and plunge into new forests.

Beyond the territory of the Lombards, the country to the south and east was inhabited by various tribes of Sclavonians, who occupied the country between the Adriatic and the Danube, including a part of Hungary and Vallachia, where they mingled their settlements with the Dacian tribes who had dwelt in these regions from an earlier period.[2] The independent Sclavonians were, at this time, a nation of savage robbers, in the lowest condition of social civilisation, whose ravages and incursions were rapidly tending to reduce all their neighbours to the same state of barbarism. Their plundering expeditions were chiefly directed against the rural population of the empire, and were often pushed many days' journey to the south of the Danube. Their cruelty was dreadful: but neither their numbers nor their military power excited, at this time, any alarm that they would be able to effect permanent conquests within the bounds of the empire.[3]

[1] The Lombards are mentioned by Strabo, lib. vii. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 106. Tacitus, *De M. G.* c. 40; *Annal.* ii. 45. Procopius, *De Bello Goth.* iii. 33.

[2] Schafarik, *Slavische Alterthümer*, Deutsch. Von Mosig Von Aehrenfeld, herausgegeben Von H. Wuttke. For the Sclavonians, see vol. i. pp. 44, 68, 150, 166, 202; for the Dacians, pp. 31, 292, ii. 199. Thunmann, *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der östliche Europäischen Völker*, Leipsig 1774, where the authorities are always cited with care.

[3] Procopius, *Goth.* iii. c. 14, iv. c. 25.

The Bulgarians, a nation of Hunnish or Turkish race, ccupied the eastern parts of ancient Dacia, from the Carpaian mountains to the Dniester. Beyond them, as far as the lains to the east of the Tanais, the country was still ruled by ıe Huns, who had now separated into two independent kingoms: that to the west was called the Kutigur; and the other, o the east, the Utugur. The Huns had conquered the whole 'auric Chersonese except the city of Cherson. The imporance of the commercial relations which Cherson kept up etween the northern and southern nations was so advanageous to all parties, that while the carrying trade of the lack Sea secured wealth and power to these distant Greek olonists, it also maintained them in possession of their olitical independence.[1]

In the early part of Justinian's reign (A.D. 528) the city of osporus was taken and plundered by the Huns. It was on recovered by an expedition fitted out by the emperor at)dyssopolis (Varna); but these repeated conquests of a ıercantile emporium, and an agricultural colony, by pastoral omades like the Huns, and by mercenary soldiers like the mperial army, must have had a very depressing effect on the reıains of Greek civilisation in the Tauric Chersonesus.[2] The ıcreasing barbarism of the inhabitants of these regions diminhed the commerce which had once flourished in the neighbourıg lands, and which was now almost entirely centred in Cherson. 'he hordes of plundering nomades, who never remained long ı one spot, had little to sell, and did not possess the means f purchasing foreign luxuries; and the language and manners f the Greeks, which had once been prevalent all around the ıores of the Euxine, began from this time to fall into neglect.[3] 'he various Greek cities which still maintained some portion f their ancient social and municipal institutions received ıany severe blows during the reign of Justinian. The towns f Kepoi and Phanagoris, situated near the Cimmerian osphorus, was taken by the Huns.[4] Sebastopolis, or Dios-

1 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iv. 18. For proofs that the Huns at one time possessed the Crimea, *De Ædificiis*, iii. 7; *De Bello Pers.* i. 12. That Roman garrisons cupied Cherson and Bosporus in the time of Justin, *Pers.* i. 12, and of Justinian, ıeophanes, *Chron.* p. 159. Procopius (*De Bello Pers.* i. 12) speaks of Cherson, the st city of the Roman empire, as twenty days' journey from the city of Bosporus. To ıat Cherson does he allude? There was a city of this name near the modern Warna. ıeophanes, *Chron.* 153.

2 Theophanes, 150, edit. Par. Lebeau, viii. 105.

3 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iv. 7. Ἑλληνίζοντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Agathias (l. iv. 103) mentions that the chiefs of the Lazes understood Greek.

4 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iv. 5.

polis, and Pityontis, distant two days' journey from one another, on the eastern shores of the Euxine, were abandoned by their garrisons during the Colchian war; and the conquests of the Avars at last confined the influence of the Roman empire, and the trade and civilisation of the Greeks, to the cities of Bosporus and Cherson.[1]

It is necessary to record a few incidents which mark the progress of barbarism, poverty, and depopulation, in the lands to the south of the Danube, and explain the causes which compelled the Roman and Greek races to abandon their settlements in these countries. Though the commencement of Justinian's reign was illustrated by a signal defeat of the Antes, a powerful Sclavonian tribe, still the invasions of that people were soon renewed with all their former vigour. In the year 533 they defeated and slew Chilbudius, a Roman general of great reputation, whose name indicates his northern origin. In 538 a band of Bulgarians defeated the Roman army charged with the defence of the country, captured the general Constantiolus, and compelled him to purchase his liberty by the payment of one thousand pounds of gold,—a sum which was considered sufficient for the ransom of the flourishing city of Antioch by the Persian monarch Chosroes.[2] In 539 the Gepids ravaged Illyria, and the Huns laid waste the whole country from the Adriatic to the long wall which protected Constantinople. Cassandra was taken, and the peninsula of Pallene plundered; the fortifications of the Thracian Chersonese were forced, and a body of the Huns crossed over the Dardanelles into Asia, while another, after ravaging Thessaly, turned Thermopylæ, and plundered Greece as far as the Isthmus of Corinth. In this expedition, the Huns are said to have collected and carried away one hundred and twenty thousand prisoners, chiefly belonging to the rural population of the Greek provinces.[3] The fortifications erected by Justinian, and the attention which the misfortunes of his arms compelled him to pay to the efficiency of his troops on the northern frontier, restrained the incursions of the barbarians for some years after this fearful foray; but in 548, the Sclavonians again ravaged Illyria to the very walls of Dyrrachium, murdering the inhabitants, and carrying them away as slaves in face

[1] In the reign of Justin II. (A.D. 575) a Turkish army besieged and took Bosporus, and established itself for some time in the Chersonesus.—Menander, 404, edit. Bonn.

[2] A. D. 540. Chosroes offered to leave Antioch unattacked for 1000 lb. of gold; his offer was refused, and he took the city. See *infra*, page 263.

[3] Procopius, *De Bello Pers.* ii. 4.

of a Roman army of fifteen thousand men, which was unable to arrest their progress.[1] In 550 fresh incursions desolated Illyria and Thrace. Topirus, a flourishing city on the Ægean Sea, was taken by assault. Fifteen thousand of the inhabitants were massacred, while an immense number of women and children were carried away into captivity. In 551 an eunuch named Scholasticus, who was intrusted with the defence of Thrace, was defeated by the barbarians near Adrianople. Next year, the Sclavonians again entered Illyria and Thrace, and these provinces were reduced to such a state of disorder, that an exiled Lombard prince, who was dissatisfied with the rank and treatment which he had received from Justinian, taking advantage of the confusion, fled from Constantinople with a company of the imperial guards and a few of his own countrymen, and, after traversing all Thrace and Illyria, plundering the country as he passed, and evading the imperial troops, at last reached the country of the Gepids in safety. Even Greece, though usually secure from its distance and its mountain passes against the incursions of the northern nations, did not escape the general destruction. It has been mentioned that Totila despatched a fleet of three hundred vessels from Italy to ravage Corfou and the coast of Epirus, and this expedition plundered Nicopolis and Dodona.[2] Repeated ravages at last reduced the great plains of Mœsia to such a state of desolation that Justinian allowed even the savage Huns to form settlements to the south of the Danube.

Thus the Roman government began to replace the agricultural population by hordes of nomade herdsmen, and abandoned the defence of civilisation as a vain struggle against the increasing strength of barbarism.[3]

The most celebrated invasion of the empire at this period, though by no means the most destructive, was that of Zabergan, the king of the Kutigur Huns, who crossed the Danube in the year 559. Its historical fame is derived from its success in approaching the walls of Constantinople, and because its defeat was the last military exploit of Belisarius. Zabergan had formed his army into three divisions, and he found the country everywhere so destitute of defence, that he ventured to advance on the capital with one division, amounting to only seven thousand men. After all the lavish and

1 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iii. 29.
2 Ibid. *De Bello Gotth.* iv. 22. See above, page 227.
3 Procopius, *De Bello Gotth.* iv. 27.

injudicious expenditure of Justinian in building forts and erecting fortifications, he had allowed the long wall of Anastasius to fall into such a state of dilapidation, that Zabergan passed it without difficulty, and advanced to within seventeen miles of Constantinople, before he encountered any serious resistance. The modern historian must be afraid of conveying a false impression of the weakness of the empire, and of magnifying the neglect of the government, if he venture to transcribe the ancient accounts of this expedition. Yet the miserable picture which ancient writers have drawn of the close of Justinian's reign is authenticated by the calamities of his successors. As soon as the wars with the Persians and Goths ceased, Justinian dismissed the greater part of those chosen mercenaries who had proved themselves the best troops of the age, and he neglected to fill up the vacancies in the native legions of the empire by enrolling new conscripts. His immense expenditure in fortifications, civil and religious buildings, and court pageants, forced him at times to be as economical and rapacious as he was at others careless and lavish. The army which had achieved so many foreign conquests was now so reduced, and the garrison of Constantinople, where Belisarius had appeared with seven thousand horsemen, was so neglected, that the great wall was left unguarded. Zabergan established his camp at the village of Melantias, on the river Athyras, which flows into the lake now called Buyuk Tchekmedjee, or the great bridge.

At this crisis the fate of the Roman empire depended on the ill-paid and neglected troops of the line, who formed the ordinary garrison of the capital, and on the veterans and pensioners who happened to reside at Constantinople, and who immediately resumed their arms. The corps of imperial guards called Silentiarioi, Protectores, and Domestikoi, shared with the chosen mercenaries the duty of mounting guard on the fortifications of the imperial palace, and of protecting the person of Justinian, not only against the barbarian enemy, but also against any attempt which a rebellious general or a seditious subject might make, to profit by the general confusion. After the walls of Constantinople were properly manned, Belisarius marched out of the city with his army. The principal body of his troops, from the regularity of its organisation and the splendour of its equipments, was the legion of Scholarians. Their ordinary duty was to guard the outer court and the avenues of the emperor's residence, and

heir number amounted to 3500. They may be considered as he representatives of the prætorian guards of an earlier period f Roman history, and the manner in which their discipline vas ruined by Justinian affords a curious parallel to many imilar bodies in other despotic states. The scholarians eceived higher pay than the troops of the line. Previous to he reign of Zeno, they had been composed of veteran soldiers, vho were appointed to vacancies in the corps as a reward for ood service. Armenians were generally preferred by Zeno's mmediate predecessors, because the volunteers of this warlike ation were considered more likely to remain firmly attached o the emperor's person in case of any rebellious movement in he empire, than native subjects who might participate in the xasperation caused by the measures of the government. The nstability of Zeno's throne induced him to change the rganisation of the scholarians. His object was to form a body of troops whose interests secured their fidelity to his erson. Instead of veteran soldiers who brought their military abits and prejudices into the corps, he filled its ranks with his wn countrymen, from the mountains of Isauria. These men vere valiant, and accustomed to the use of arms. Though hey were ignorant of tactics and impatient of discipline, their bedience to their officers was secured by their attachment to eno as their countryman and benefactor, and by their absolute dependence on his power as emperor for the enjoyment f their enviable position. The jealousy with which these ude mountaineers were regarded by the whole army, and the atred felt to them by the people of Constantinople, kept them eparate from the rest of the world, secluded in their barracks nd steady to their duty in the palace. Anastasius and ustin I. introduced the practice of appointing the scholarians y favour, without reference to their military services; and ustinian is accused of establishing the abuse of selling places n their ranks to wealthy citizens, and householders of the apital who had no intention of following a military life, but vho purchased their enrolment in the scholarians to enjoy the rivilege of the military class in the Roman empire. It is emarkable that absolute princes, whose power is so seriously ndangered by the inefficiency of their army, should be so ften themselves the corrupters of its discipline. The abuses hich render chosen troops useless as soldiers are generally ntroduced by the sovereign, as in this example of the scholarians of Justinian, but they are sometimes caused by the

power of the soldiers, who convert their corps into a hereditar corporation, as in the case of the janissaries of the Othoma empire.[1]

On such troops Belisarius was forced to depend for th defence of the country round Constantinople, and for th more difficult task of conserving his own military reputatio unsullied in his declining years. While the federates remaine to guard Justinian, his general marched to encounter th Huns at the head of a motley army, composed of the neglecte troops of the line, and of the sleek scholarians, who, thoug they formed the most imposing and brilliant portion of hi force in appearance, were in reality the worst-trained and leas courageous troops under his orders. A crowd of volunteer also joined his standard, and from these he was able to selec upwards of 300 of those veteran horse-guards who had bee so often victorious over the Goths and the Persians. Belisariu established his camp at Chettoukome, a position whic enabled him to circumscribe the ravages of the Huns, an stop their advance to the villages and country houses in th immediate vicinity of Constantinople. The peasants who ha fled from the enemy assembled round his army, and thei labour enabled him to cover his position with strong work and a deep ditch, before the Huns could prepare to attack hi troops.

There can be no doubt that the historians of this campaig misrepresent the facts when they state that the Roman arm was inferior in number to the division of the Huns whic Zabergan led against Constantinople. This inferiority coul only exist in the cavalry; but we know that Belisarius had n confidence in the Roman infantry, and the ill-disciplined troops then under his orders must have excited his contempt They, on the other hand, were confident in their numbers, an their general was fearful lest their rashness should compromis his plan of operations. He therefore addressed them in speech, which modified their precipitation by assuring them o success after a little delay. A cavalry engagement, in whic Zabergan led 2000 Huns in person to beat up the quarters o the Romans, was completely defeated. Belisarius allowed th enemy to approach without opposition, but before they coul

[1] Agathias, lib. v. p. 159, edit. Par. Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 24. Compare wha Tacitus (*Hist.* 1. 46) says of the abuses in the prætorian guards, caused by the office selling leave of absence to the soldiers. Corruption would have appeared to him natura in Greek prætorians. "Mox donati civitate Romana, signa armaque in nostru modum, desidiam licentiamque Græcorum retinebant."

extend their line to charge, they were assailed in flank by the unexpected attack of a body of two hundred chosen cavalry, which issued suddenly from a woody glen, and at the same moment Belisarius charged them in front. The shock was irresistible. The Huns fled instantly, but their retreat was embarrassed by their position, and they left four hundred men dead on the field. This trifling affair finished the campaign. The Huns, finding that they could no longer collect supplies, were anxious to save the booty in their possession. They broke up their camp at Melantias, retired to St. Stratonikos, and hastened to escape beyond the long wall. Belisarius had no body of cavalry with which he could venture to pursue an active and experienced enemy. An unsuccessful skirmish might still compromise the safety of many districts, and the jealousy of Justinian was perhaps as dangerous as the army of Zabergan. The victor returned to Constantinople, and there heard himself reproached by courtiers and sycophants for not bringing back the king of the Kutigurs a prisoner, as in other days he had presented the kings of the Vandals and of the Ostrogoths captives before Justinian's throne. Belisarius was ungratefully treated by Justinian, suspected of resenting the imperial ingratitude, accused of treason, plundered, and pardoned.

The division of the Huns sent against the Thracian Chersonese was as unsuccessful as the main body of the army. But while the Huns were incapable of forcing the wall which defended the isthmus, they so utterly despised the Roman garrison, that six hundred embarked on rafts, in order to paddle round the fortifications. The Byzantine general possessed twenty galleys, and with this naval force he easily destroyed all who had ventured to sea. A well-timed sally on the barbarians who had witnessed the destruction of their comrades, routed the remainder, and showed them that their contempt of the Roman soldiery had been carried too far. The third division of the Huns had been ordered to advance through Macedonia and Thessaly. It penetrated as far as Thermopylæ, but was not very successful in collecting plunder, and retreated with as little glory as the other two.

Justinian, who had seen a barbarian at the head of an army of twenty thousand men ravage a considerable portion of his empire, instead of pursuing and crushing the invader, engaged the king of the Utugur Huns, by promises and money, to attack Zabergan. These intrigues were successful, and the

dissensions of the two monarchs prevented the Huns fro again attacking the empire. A few years after this incursio the Avars invaded Europe, and, by subduing both the Hunnis kingdoms, gave the Roman emperor a far more dangerous an powerful neighbour than had lately threatened his norther frontier.

The Turks and the Avars become politically known to th Greeks, for the first time, towards the end of Justinian's reig Since that period the Turks have always continued to occup a memorable place in the history of mankind, as the destroyer of ancient civilisation. In their progress towards the Wes they were preceded by the Avars, a people whose arrival i Europe produced the greatest alarm, whose dominion wa soon widely extended, but whose complete extermination, c amalgamation with their subjects, leaves the history of the race a problem never likely to receive a very satisfactor solution. The Avars are supposed to have been a portion c the inhabitants of a powerful Asiatic empire which figures i the annals of China as ruling a great part of the centre c Asia, and extending to the Gulf of Corea. The great empir of the Avars was overthrown by a rebellion of their Turkis subjects, and the noblest caste soon became lost to histor amidst the revolutions of the Chinese empire.

The original seats of the Turks were in the country roun the great chain of Mount Altai. As subjects of the Avar they had been distinguished by their skill in working an tempering iron; their industry had procured them wealth, an wealth had inspired them with the desire for independenc After throwing off the yoke of the Avars, they waged war wit that people, and compelled the military strength of the natio to fly before them in two separate bodies. One of thes divisions fell back on China; the other advanced into weste Asia, and at last entered Europe. The Turks engaged in career of conquest, and in a few years their dominio extended from the Wolga and the Caspian Sea to the shor of the ocean, or the Sea of Japan, and from the banks of th Oxus (Gihoun) to the deserts of Siberia. The western arm of the Avars, increased by many tribes who feared the Turkis government, advanced into Europe as a nation of conqueror and not as a band of fugitives. The mass of this army supposed to have been composed of people of the Turkis race, because those who afterwards bore the Avar name Europe seem to have belonged to that family. It must no

however, be forgotten, that the mighty army of Avar emigrants might easily, in a few generations, lose all national peculiarities, and forget its native language, amidst the greater number of its Hunnish subjects, even if we should suppose the two races to have been originally derived from different stocks. The Avars, however, are sometimes styled Turks, even by the earliest historians. The use of the appellation Turk, in an extended sense, including the Mongol race, is found in Theophylactus Simocatta, a writer possessing considerable knowledge of the affairs of eastern Asia, and who speaks of the inhabitants of the flourishing kingdom of Taugus as Turks.[1] This application of the term appears to have arisen from the circumstance, that the part of China to which he alluded was subject at the time to a foreign, or, in his phrase, a Turkish dynasty.

The Avars soon conquered all the countries as far as the banks of the Danube, and before Justinian's death they were firmly established on the borders of Pannonia. Their pursuers, the Turks, did not visit Europe until a later period; but they extended their conquests in central Asia, where they destroyed the kingdom of the Ephthalite Huns to the east of Persia, a part of which Chosroes had already subdued.[2] They engaged in long wars with the Persians; but it is sufficient to pass over the history of the first Turkish empire with this slight notice, as it exercised but a very trifling direct influence on the fortunes of the Greek nation. The wars of the Turks and Persians tended, however, greatly to weaken the Persian empire, to reduce its resources, and increase the oppression of the internal administration, by the call for extraordinary exertions, and thus prepared the way for the easier conquest of the country by the followers of Mahomet.

The sudden appearance of the Avars and Turks in history, marks the singular void which a long period of vicious government and successive conquests had created in the population of regions which were once flourishing. Both these nations took a prominent part in the destruction of the frame of ancient society in Europe and Asia; but neither of them con-

1 Theoph. Sim. vii. 7. Ἔθνος ἀλκιμώτατον καὶ πολυανθρωπότατον καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἔθνεσί, διὰ το μέγεθος, ἀπαράλληλον. He calls the Avars Scythians, vii. c. 8. Menander (298, edit. Bonn) mentions that the Turks used the Scythian character (?) in the letter they addressed to Justin II. What alphabet was called Scythian in the sixth century is a question.

2 Vivien de Saint Martin, *Les Huns Blanc ou Ephthalites des Historiens Byzantins*, p. 77. This work shows the uncertainty of modern inquiries concerning the ethnological history of the Huns.

tributed anything to the reorganisation of the political, social, or religious condition of the modern world. Their empires soon fell to decay, and the very nations were again almost lost to history. The Avars, after having attempted the conquest of Constantinople, became at last extinct; and the Turks, after having been long forgotten, slowly rose to a high degree of power, and at length achieved the conquest of Constantinople, which their ancient rivals had vainly attempted.

Section VIII

Relations of the Roman Empire with Persia

The Asiatic frontier of the Roman empire was less favourable for attack than defence. The range of the Caucasus was occupied, as it still is, by a cluster of small nations of various languages, strongly attached to their independence, which the nature of their country enabled them to maintain amidst the wars and conflicting negotiations of the Romans, Persians, and Huns, by whom they were surrounded. The kingdom of Colchis (Mingrelia) was in permanent alliance with the Romans, and the sovereign received a regular investiture from the emperor. The Tzans, who inhabited the mountains about the sources of the Phasis, enjoyed a subsidiary alliance with Justinian until their plundering expeditions within the precincts of the empire induced him to garrison their country. Iberia, to the east of Colchis, the modern Georgia, formed an independent kingdom under the protection of Persia.

Armenia, as an independent kingdom, had long formed a slight counterpoise between the Roman and Persian empires. In the reign of Theodosius II. it had been partitioned by its powerful neighbours; and about the year 429, it had lost the shadow of independence which it had been allowed to retain. The greater part of Armenia had fallen to the share of the Persians; but as the people were Christians, and possessed their own church and literature, they had maintained their nationality uninjured after the loss of their political government. The western, or Roman part of Armenia, was bounded by the mountains in which the Araxes, the Boas, and the Euphrates take their rise; and it was defended against Persia by the fortress of Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum), situated on the very frontier of Pers-Armenia.[1] From Theodosiopolis the

[1] Saint Martin, *Mémoires Historiques et Géographiques sur l'Arménie*, i. 65.

empire was bounded by ranges of mountains which cross the Euphrates and extend to the River Nymphæus, and here the city of Martyropolis, the capital of Roman Armenia, east of the Euphrates, was situated.[1] From the junction of the Nymphæus with the Tigris the frontier again followed the mountains to Dara, and from thence it proceeded to the Chaboras and the fortress of Kirkesium.

The Arabs or Saracens who inhabited the district between Kirkesium and Idumæa, were divided into two kingdoms: that of Ghassan, towards Syria, maintained an alliance with the Romans; and that of Hira, to the east, enjoyed the protection of Persia. Palmyra, which had fallen into ruins after the time of Theodosius II., was repaired and garrisoned;[2] and the country between the Gulfs of Ailath and Suez, forming a province called the Third Palestine, was protected by a fortress constructed at the foot of Mount Sinai, and occupied by a strong body of troops.[3]

Such a frontier, though it presented great difficulties in the way of invading Persia, afforded admirable means for protecting the empire; and, accordingly, it had very rarely indeed happened that a Persian army had ever penetrated into a Roman province. It was reserved for Justinian's reign to behold the Persians break through the defensive line, and contribute to the ruin of the wealth, and the destruction of the civilisation, of some of the most flourishing and enlightened portions of the Eastern Empire. The wars which Justinian carried on with Persia reflect little glory on his reign; but the celebrated name of his rival, the great Chosroes Nushirvan, has rendered his misfortunes and misconduct venial in the eyes of historians. The Persian and Roman empires were at this time nearly equal in power and civilisation: both were ruled by princes whose reigns form national epochs; yet history affords ample evidence that the brilliant exploits of both these sovereigns were effected by a wasteful expenditure of the national resources, and by a consumption of the lives and capital of their subjects which proved irreparable. Neither empire was ever able to regain its former state of prosperity, nor could society recover the shock which it had received. The governments were too demoralised to venture on political reforms, and the people too ignorant and too feeble to attempt a national revolution.

1 This was called the Fourth Armenia.—*Justiniani Nov.* xxxi.
2 *Malalæ Ch.* pr. ii. p. 53, edit Venet.
3 Procopius, *Ædific.* v. 8. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, viii. 115.

The governments of declining countries often give but slight signs of their weakness and approaching dissolution as long as the ordinary relations of war and peace require to be maintained only with habitual friends or enemies, though the slightest exertion, created by extraordinary circumstances, may cause the political fabric to fall to pieces. The armies of the Eastern Empire and of Persia had, by long acquaintance with the military force of one another, found the means of balancing any peculiar advantage of their enemy, by a modification of tactics, or by an improvement in military discipline, which neutralised its effect. War between the two states was consequently carried on according to a regular routine of service, and was continued during a succession of campaigns in which much blood and treasure were expended, and much glory gained, with very little change in the relative military power, and none in the frontiers, of the two empires.

The avarice of Justinian, or his inconstant plans, often induced him to leave the eastern frontier of the empire very inadequately garrisoned; and this frontier presented an extent of country against which a Persian army, concentrated behind the Tigris, could choose its point of attack. The option of carrying the war into Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, or Colchis, generally lay with the Persians; and Chosroes attempted to penetrate into the empire by every portion of this frontier during his long wars. The Roman army, in spite of the change which had taken place in its arms and organisation, still retained its superiority.

The war in which Justinian found the empire engaged on his succession, was terminated by a peace which the Romans purchased by the payment of eleven thousand pounds of gold to Chosroes. The Persian monarch required peace to regulate the affairs of his own kingdom; and the calculation of Justinian, that the sum which he paid to Persia was much less than the expense of continuing the war, though correct, was injudicious, as it really conveyed an admission of inferiority and weakness. Justinian's object had been to place the great body of his military forces at liberty, in order to direct his exclusive attention to recovering the lost provinces of the Western Empire. Had he availed himself of peace with Persia to diminish the burdens on his subjects, and consolidate the defence of the empire instead of extending its frontiers, he might perhaps have re-established the Roman power. As soon as Chosroes heard of the conquests of

Justinian in Africa, Sicily, and Italy, his jealousy induced him to renew the war. The solicitations of an embassy sent by Witiges are said to have had some effect in determining him to take up arms.

In 540 Chosroes invaded Syria with a powerful army, and laid siege to Antioch, the second city of the empire in population and wealth. He offered to raise the siege on receiving payment of one thousand pounds' weight of gold, but this small sum was refused. Antioch was taken by storm, its buildings were committed to the flames, and its inhabitants were carried away captive, and settled as colonists in Persia. Hierapolis, Berrhœa (Aleppo), Apamea, and Chalcis, escaped this fate by paying the ransom demanded from each. To save Syria from utter destruction, Belisarius was sent to take the command of an army assembled for its defence, but he was ill supported, and his success was by no means brilliant. The fact that he saved Syria from utter devastation, nevertheless, rendered his campaign of 543 by no means unimportant for the empire. The war was carried on for twenty years, but during the latter period of its duration, military operations were confined to Colchis. It was terminated in 562 by a truce for fifty years, which effected little change in the frontiers of the empire. The most remarkable clause of this treaty of peace, imposed on Justinian the disgraceful obligation of paying Chosroes an annual subsidy of thirty thousand pieces of gold; and he was compelled immediately to advance the sum of two hundred and ten thousand, for seven years. The sum, it is true, was not very great, but the condition of the Roman empire was sadly changed, when it became necessary to purchase peace from all its neighbours with gold, and with gold to find mercenary troops to carry on its wars. The moment, therefore, a supply of gold failed in the imperial treasury, the safety of the Roman power was compromised.

The weakness of the Roman empire, and the necessity of finding allies in the East, in order to secure a share of the lucrative commerce of which Persia had long possessed a monopoly, induced Justinian to keep up friendly communications with the king of Ethiopia (Abyssinia). Elesboas, who then occupied the Ethiopian throne, was a prince of great power, and a steady ally of the Romans. The wars of this Christian monarch in Arabia are related by the historians of the empire; and Justinian endeavoured, by his means, to transfer the silk trade with India from Persia to the route by

the Red Sea. The attempt failed from the great length of the sea voyage, and the difficulties of adjusting the intermediate commerce of the countries on this line of communication; but still the trade of the Red Sea was so great, that the king of Ethiopia, in the reign of Justin, was able to collect a fleet of seven hundred native vessels, and six hundred Roman and Persian merchantmen, which he employed to transport his troops into Arabia.[1] The diplomatic relations of Justinian with the Avars and Turks, and particularly with the latter nation, were influenced by the position of the Roman empire with regard to Persia, both in a commercial and political point of view.[2]

Section IX

Commercial position of the Greeks, and comparison with the other nations living under the Roman government

Until the northern nations conquered the southern provinces of the Western Empire, the commerce of Europe was in the hands of the subjects of the Roman emperors; and the monopoly of the Indian trade, its most lucrative branch, was almost exclusively possessed by the Greeks.[3] But the invasions of the barbarians, by diminishing the wealth of the countries which they subdued, greatly diminished the demand for the valuable merchandise imported from the East; and the financial extortions of the imperial government gradually impoverished the Greek population of Syria, Egypt, and Cyrenaïca, the greater portion of which had derived its prosperity from this now declining trade. In order to comprehend fully the change which must have taken place in the commercial relations of the Greeks with the western portion of Europe, it is necessary to compare the situation of each province, in the reign of Justinian, with its condition in the time of Hadrian. Many countries which had once supported an extensive trade in articles of luxury imported from the East, became incapable of purchasing any foreign

[1] Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, viii. 60. Acta Martyr. Metaphrast. ap. Surium, tom. v. p. 1042.

[2] Theophanes, *Ch.* 196. *Malalæ Ch.* pars 2, p. 81, edit. Venet. Menander, *Exc. Leg.* p. 282, edit. Bonn. Theophanes, *Ch.* 203.

[3] "Minimaque computatione millies centena millia sestertiùm annis omnibus India et Seres, peninsulaque illa, Arabia, imperio nostro adimunt, tanto nobis deliciæ et feminæ constant."—Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* lib. xii. c. xviii.

production, and could hardly supply a diminished and impoverished population with the mere necessaries of life.[1] The wines of Lesbos, Rhodes, Cnidus, Thasos, Chios, Samos, and Cyprus, the woollen cloths of Miletus and Laodicea, the purple dresses of Tyre, Getulia, and Laconia, the cambric of Cos, the manuscripts of Egypt and Pergamus, the perfumes, spices, pearls, and jewels of India, the ivory, the slaves, and tortoise-shell of Africa, and the silks of China, were once abundant on the banks of the Rhine and in the north of Britain. Treves and York were long wealthy and flourishing cities, where every foreign luxury could be obtained. Incredible quantities of the precious metals in coined money then circulated freely, and trade was carried on with activity far beyond the limits of the empire. The Greeks who traded in amber and fur, though they may have rarely visited the northern countries in person, maintained constant communications with these distant lands, and paid for the commodities which they imported in gold and silver coin, in ornaments, and by inducing the barbarians to consume the luxuries, the spices, and the incense of the East. Nor was the trade in statues, pictures, vases, and objects of art in marble, metals, earthenware, ivory, and painting, a trifling branch of commerce, as it may be conjectured from the relics which are now so frequently found, after having remained concealed for ages beneath the soil.

In the time of Justinian, Britain, Gaul, Rhætia, Pannonia, Noricum, and Vindelicia, were reduced to such a state of poverty and desolation, that their foreign commerce was almost annihilated, and their internal trade reduced to a trifling exchange of the rudest commodities. Even the south of Gaul, Spain, Italy, Africa, and Sicily, had suffered a great decrease of population and wealth under the government of the Goths and Vandals; and though their cities still carried on a considerable commerce with the East, that commerce was very much less than it had been in the times of the empire.[2] As the greater part of the trade of the Mediterranean was in the hands of the Greeks, this trading population was often regarded in the West as the type of the inhabitants of

[1] The emperor Julian says, "Ex immensis opibus egentissima est tandem Romana Respublica, impetitum ærarium est, urbes exinanitæ, populatæ provinciæ."—Ammianus Marcellinus, xxiv. c. 3.

[2] Vides universa Italiæ loca originariis viduata cultoribus, et illa mater humanæ messis Liguria, cui numerosa agricolarum solebat constare progenies, orbata atque sterilis jejunum cespitem nostris monstrat obtutibus."—Ennodius, v. *St. Epiph. Opera*, edit. J. Sirmondi: Paris, 1611, p. 358.

the eastern Roman empire. The mercantile class was generally regarded by the barbarians as favouring the Roman cause; and probably not without reason, for its interests must have required it to keep up constant communications with the empire. When Belisarius touched at Sicily, on his way to attack the Vandals, Procopius found a friend at Syracuse, who was a merchant, carrying on extensive dealings in Africa, as well as with the East. The Vandals, when they were threatened by Justinian's expedition, threw many of the merchants of Carthage into prison, as they suspected them of favouring Belisarius. The laws adopted by the barbarians for regulating the trade of their native subjects,[1] and the dislike with which most of the Gothic nations viewed trade, manufactures, and commerce, naturally placed all commercial and money transactions in the hands of strangers. When it happened that war or policy excluded the Greeks from participating in these transactions, they were generally conducted by the Jews. We find, indeed, after the fall of the Western Empire, that the Jews, availing themselves of their commercial knowledge and neutral political character, began to be very numerous in all the countries gained by conquest from the Romans, and particularly so in those situated on the Mediterranean, which maintained constant communications with the East.

Several circumstances, however, during the reign of Justinian contributed to augment the commercial transactions of the Greeks, and to give them a decided preponderance in the Eastern trade. The long war with Persia cut off all those routes by which the Syrian and Egyptian population had maintained their ordinary communications with Persia: and it was from Persia that they had always drawn their silk, and great part of their Indian commodities, such as muslins and jewels. This trade now began to seek two different channels, by both of which it avoided the dominions of Chosroes: the one was to the north of the Caspian Sea, and the other by the Red Sea. This ancient route through Egypt still

[1] "Prætia debent communi deliberatione constitui: quia non est delectatio commercii quæ jubetur invitis." Sartorius, in citing this passage from a letter of king Athalaric, addressed to Gildia, comte of Syracuse, observes very justly, "J'entends par les mots *deliberatio communis*, non pas ce dont les acheteurs et vendeurs conviennent entre eux, ce qui serait un commerce libre; mais comme il est prouvé par tout ce qui précède, une vente et un achat d'après les prix fixés d'un commun accord entre les magistrat, l'évêque, et le peuple, ce qui est précisement le contraire."—See Cassiodorus, *Variæ*, xi. 14. Sartorius, *Essai sur l'Etat civil et politique des Peuples d'Italie, sous le gouvernement des Goths*, 333.

continued to be that of the ordinary trade. But the importance of the northern route, and the extent of the trade carried on by it through different ports on the Black Sea, are authenticated by the numerous colony of the inhabitants of central Asia established at Constantinople in the reign of Justin II. Six hundred Turks availed themselves, at one time, of the security offered by the journey of a Roman ambassador to the Great Khan of the Turks, and joined his train.[1] This fact affords the strongest evidence of the great importance of this route, as there can be no question that the great number of the inhabitants of central Asia, who visited Constantinople, were attracted to it by their commercial occupations.

The Indian commerce through Arabia and by the Red Sea was still more important; much more so, indeed, than the mere mention of Justinian's failure to establish a regular importation of silk by this route might lead us to suppose. The immense number of trading vessels which habitually frequented the Red Sea shows that it was very great.

It is true that the population of Arabia now first began to share the profits and feel the influence of this trade. The spirit of improvement and inquiry roused by the excitement of this new field of enterprise, and the new subjects for thought which it opened, prepared the children of the desert for national union, and awakened the social and political impulse which gave birth to the character of Mahomet.

As the whole trade of western Europe, in Chinese and Indian productions, passed through the hands of the Greeks, its amount, though small in any one district, yet as a whole must have been large. The Greek mercantile population of the Eastern Empire had declined, though perhaps not yet in the same proportion as the other classes, so that the relative importance of the trade remained as great as ever with regard to the general wealth of the empire; and its profits were probably greater than formerly, since the restricted nature of the transactions in the various localities must have discouraged competitors and produced the effects of a monopoly, even in those countries where no recognised privileges were granted to the merchants. Justinian was also fortunate enough to secure to the Greeks the complete control of the silk trade, by enabling them to share in the production and manufacture of this precious commodity. This trade had excited the attention

[1] Menander, p. 398, edit. Bonn.

of the Romans at an early period. One of the emperors, probably Marcus Aurelius, had sent an ambassador to the East, with the view of establishing commercial relations with the country where silk was produced, and this ambassador succeeded in reaching China.[1] Justinian long attempted in vain to open direct communications with China; but all his efforts to obtain a direct supply of silk either proved unavailing or were attended with very partial success.[2] The people of the Roman empire were compelled to purchase the greater part of their silk from the Persians, who alone were able to supply the Chinese and Indian trade with the commodities suitable for that distant market. The Persians were, however, unable to retain the monopoly of this profitable commerce; for the high price of silk in the West during the Persian wars induced the nations of central Asia to avail themselves of every opportunity of opening direct communications by land with China, and conveying it, by caravans, to the frontiers of the Roman empire. This trade followed various channels, according to the security which political circumstances afforded to the traders. At times it was directed towards the frontiers of Armenia, while at others it proceeded as far north as the Sea of Asof. Jornandes, in speaking of Cherson at this time, calls it a city whence the merchant imports the produce of Asia.[3]

At a moment when Justinian must almost have abandoned the hope of participating in the direct trade with China, he was fortunate enough to be put in possession of the means of cultivating silk in his own dominions. Christian missions had been the means of extending very widely the benefits of civilisation. Christian missionaries first maintained a regular communication between Ethiopia and the Roman empire, and they had frequently visited China.[4] In the year 551 two monks, who had studied the method of rearing silkworms and winding silk in China, succeeded in conveying the eggs of the moth to Constantinople, enclosed in a cane. The emperor, delighted with the acquisition, granted them every assistance which they required, and encouraged their undertaking with great zeal. It would not, therefore, be just to deny to

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xl. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, ix. 222. Saint Martin.

[2] Procopius, *De Bello Pers.* i. 20.

[3] Jornandes, *De Rebus Geticis*, c. ii. "Juxta Chersonem, quo Asiæ bona avidus mercator importat."

[4] *Versuch einer allgemeinen Missions Geschichte der Kirche von Stumbaldi.* — Basel, iii. 40.

Justinian some share in the merit of having founded a flourishing branch of trade, which tended very materially to support the resources of the Eastern Empire, and to enrich the Greek nation for several centuries.[1]

The Greeks, at this time, maintained their superiority over the other people in the empire only by their commercial enterprise, which preserved that civilisation in the trading cities which was rapidly disappearing among the agricultural population. The Greeks in general were now reduced almost to the same level with the Syrians, Egyptians, Armenians, and Jews. The Greeks of Cyrenaïca and Alexandria had suffered from the same government, and declined in the same proportion as the native population. Of the decline of Egypt we possess exact information, which it may not be unprofitable to pass in review. In the reign of Augustus, Egypt furnished Rome with a tribute of twenty millions of modii of grain annually,[2] and it was garrisoned by a force rather exceeding twelve thousand regular troops.[3] Under Justinian the tribute in grain was reduced to about five millions and a half modii, that is 800,000 artabas; and the Roman troops, to a cohort of six hundred men.[4] There can be little doubt that even the reduced production and diminished prosperity of Egypt were prevented from sinking still lower by the exportation of a portion of its grain to supply the trading population on the shores of the Red Sea. The canal connecting the Nile with the Red Sea afforded the means of exporting an immense quantity of the inferior qualities of grain to the arid coasts of Arabia, and formed a great artery for the civilisation and commerce of Arabia and Ethiopia.

About this period the Jewish nation attained a degree of importance which is worthy of attention, as explaining many circumstances connected with the history of the human race. It appears unquestionable that the Jews had increased very much in the age immediately preceding Justinian's reign. This increase is to be accounted for by the decline of the rest of the population in the countries round the Mediterranean,

1 Aristotle (*Hist. Animalium.* v. c. xvii. 6) mentions that the art of manufacturing the silk of some species of caterpillars was known in Cos.

2 Aurelius Victor, ep. c. 1, "Ducenties centena millia modiorum."

3 More, certainly, under Augustus; but under Tiberius, Nero, and Vespasian, the garrison was two legions.—Tacitus, *Ann.* 4, 5. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16, 4. Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 16. Varges, *De Statu Ægypti*, 69.

4 Justinian, *Edict.* xiii. Ptolemy Philadelphus had only received 1,500,000 artabas of grain as tribute, but he received a money revenue of 14,800 talents, about £2,500,000 sterling. Egypt was now incapable of making any such payments. The customs of its ports, and the taxes of its towns, must have formed a comparatively small sum.

and by the general decay of civilisation, in consequence of the severity of the Roman fiscal system, which trammelled every class of society with regulations restricting the industry of the people. These circumstances afforded an opening for the Jews, whose social position had been previously so bad, that the decline of their neighbours, at least, afforded them some relative improvement. The Jews, too, at this period, were the only neutral nation who could carry on their trade equally with the Persians, Ethiopians, Arabs, and Goths; for, though they were hated everywhere, the universal dislike was a reason for tolerating a people never likely to form common cause with any other. In Gaul and Italy they had risen to considerable importance; and in Spain they carried on an extensive trade in slaves, which excited the indignation of the Christian church, and which kings and ecclesiastical councils vainly endeavoured to destroy. The Jews generally found support from the barbarian monarchs; and Theodoric the Great granted them every species of protection. Their alliance was often necessary to render the country independent of the wealth and commerce of the Greeks.[1]

To commercial jealousy, therefore, as well as religious zeal, we must attribute some of the persecutions which the Jews sustained in the Eastern Empire. The cruelty of the Roman government nourished that bitter nationality and revengeful hatred of their enemies, which have always marked the energetic character of the Israelites; but the history of the injustice of one party, and of the crimes of the other, does not fall within the scope of this inquiry, though the position of the Jews and Greeks in modern times offers many points of similarity and comparison.

The Armenians, who at present take a large share in the trade of the East, were then entirely occupied with war and religion, and appeared in Europe only as mercenary soldiers in the pay of Justinian, in whose service many attained the highest military rank. In civilisation and literary attainments, the Armenians held, however, as high a rank as any of their contemporaries. In the year 551 their patriarch, Moses II., assembled a number of their learned men, in order to reform their calendar; and they then fixed on the era which the Armenians have since continued to use.[2] It is true that

[1] *Ed. Theod.* art. 143. Cassiod. *Var.* ep. 33, v. 37.
[2] Saint Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Armenie*, i. 330. C. F. Neumann, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Armenischen Literatur*: Leipzig, 1836, 8vo, p. 92.

the numerous translations of Greek books which distinguished the literature of Armenia were chiefly made during the preceding century, for the sixth only produced a few ecclesiastical works. The literary energy of Armenia is remarkable, inasmuch as it excited the fears of the Persian monarch, who ordered that no Armenian should visit the Eastern Empire to study at the Greek universities of Constantinople, Athens, or Alexandria.

The literature of the Greek language ceased, from this time, to possess a national character, and became more identified with the government, the governing classes of the Eastern Empire, and the orthodox church, than with the inhabitants of Greece. The fact is easily explained by the poverty of the native Hellenes, and by the position of the ruling caste in the Roman Empire. The highest offices in the court, in the civil administration, and in the orthodox church, were filled with a Greco-Roman caste, sprung originally from the Macedonian conquerors of Asia, and now proud of the Roman name which repudiated all idea of Greek nationality, and affected to treat Greek national distinctions as mere provincialism, at the very time it was acting under the impulse of Greek prejudices, both in the State and the Church. The long existence of the new Platonic school of philosophy at Athens, seems to have connected paganism with Hellenic national feelings, and Justinian was doubtless induced to put an end to it, and drive its last teachers into banishment, from his hostility to all independent institutions.

The universities of the other cities of the empire were intended for the education of the higher classes destined for the public administration, or for the church. That of Constantinople possessed a philosophical, philological, legal, and theological faculty. Alexandria added to these a celebrated medical school. Berytus was distinguished for its school of jurisprudence, and Edessa was remarkable for its Syriac, as well as its Greek faculties. The university of Antioch suffered a severe blow in the destruction of the city by Chosroes, but it again rose from its ruin. The Greek poetical literature of this age is utterly destitute of popular interest, and shows that it formed only the amusement of a class of society, not the portrait of a nation's feelings. Paul the *Silentiary*, and Agathias the historian, wrote many epigrams, which exist in the Anthology. The poem of "Hero and Leander," by Musæus, is generally supposed to have been composed about

the year 450, but it may be mentioned as one of the last Greek poems which displays a true Greek character; and it is peculiarly valuable, as affording us a testimony of the late period to which the Hellenic people preserved their correct taste. The poems of Coluthus and Tryphiodorus, which are almost of the same period, are very far inferior in merit; but as both were Egyptian Greeks, it is not surprising that their poetical productions display the frigid character of the artificial school. After this period, the verses of the Greeks are entirely destitute of the spirit of poetry, and even the curious scholar finds their perusal a wearisome task.

The prose literature of the sixth century can boast of some distinguished names. The commentary of Simplicius on the manual of Epictetus has been frequently printed, and the work has even been translated into German. Simplicius was a pupil of Damascius, and one of the philosophers who, with that celebrated teacher, visited Persia on the dispersion of the Athenian schools. The collection of Stobæus, even in the mutilated form in which we possess it, contains much curious information; the medical works of Aetius and Alexander of Tralles have been printed several times, and the geographical writings of Hierocles and Cosmas Indicopleustes possess considerable interest. In history, the writings of Procopius and Agathias are of great merit, and have been translated into several modern languages. Many other names of authors, whose works have been preserved in part and published in modern times, might be cited; but they possess little interest for the general reader, and it does not belong to our inquiry to enter into details, which can be found in the history of Greek literature, nor does it fall within our province to signalise any of the legal and ecclesiastical writers of the age.[1]

Section X

Influence of the Orthodox Church on the National Feelings of the Greeks

It is necessary here to advert to the effect which the existence of the established Church, as a constituted body, and forming a part of the State, produced both on the government

[1] *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*, (a German translation, by J. Schwarze and Dr. Pinder, of Schoell's *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*: the French original is in 8 vols. 8vo; the German translation in 3 vols.); and Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology and Biography*.

and on the people; though it will only be to notice its connection with the Greeks as a nation. The political connection of the Church with the State displayed its evil effects by the active part which the clergy took in exciting the numerous persecutions which distinguish this period. The alliance of Justinian and the Roman government of his time with the orthodox Christians was forced on the parties by their political position. Their interests in Africa, Italy, and Spain, identified the imperial party and the orthodox believers, and invited them to appeal to arms as the arbiter of opinions. It became, or was thought necessary, at times, even within the limits of the empire, to unite political and ecclesiastical power in the same hands; and the union of the office of prefect and patriarch of Egypt, in the person of Apollinarius, is a memorable instance. To the combination, therefore, of Roman policy with orthodox bigotry, we must attribute the religious persecutions of the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and other heretics; as well as of Platonic philosophers, Manichæans, Samaritans, and Jews. The various laws which Justinian enacted to enforce unity of opinion in religion, and to punish any difference of belief from that of the established church, occupy a considerable space in his legislation; yet as if to show the impossibility of fixing opinions with perfect certainty, it appeared at the end of his reign that this most orthodox of Roman emperors and munificent patron of the church, held that the body of Jesus was incorruptible, and adopted a heterodox interpretation of the Nicene creed, in denying the two natures of Christ.

The religious persecutions of Justinian tended to ripen the general feelings of dissatisfaction with the Roman government, which were universal in the provinces, into feelings of permanent hostility in all those portions of the empire in which the heretics formed the majority of the population. The orthodox church, unfortunately, rather exceeded the common measure of bigotry in this age; and it was too closely connected with the Greek nation for the spirit of persecution not to acquire a national as well as a religious character. As Greek was the language of the civil and ecclesiastical administration, those acquainted with the Greek language could alone attain the highest ecclesiastical preferments. The jealousy of the Greeks generally endeavoured to raise a suspicion of the orthodoxy of their rivals, in order to exclude them from promotion; and, consequently, the Syrians,

Egyptians, and Armenians found themselves placed in opposition to the Greeks by their national language and literature.

The Scriptures had, at a very early period, been translated into all the spoken languages of the East; and the Syrians, Egyptians, and Armenians, not only made use of their own language in the service of the church, but also possessed at this time a provincial clergy in no ways inferior to the Greek provincial clergy in learning and piety, and their ecclesiastical literature was fully equal to the portion of the Greek ecclesiastical literature which was accessible to the mass of the people. This use of the national language gave the church of each province a national character; the ecclesiastical opposition which political circumstances created in these national churches against the established church of the emperors, furnished a pretext for the imputation of heresy, and, probably, at times gave a heretical impulse to the opinions of the provincials. But a large body of the Armenians and the Chaldæans had never submitted to the supremacy of the Greek church in ecclesiastical matters, and a strong disposition to quarrel with the Greeks had always displayed itself among the natives of Egypt. Justinian carried his persecutions so far that in several provinces the natives separated from the established church and elected their own bishops, an act which, in the society of the time, was a near approach to open rebellion. Indeed, the hostility to the Roman government throughout the East was everywhere connected with an opposition to the Greek clergy. The Jews revived an old saying indicating a national as well as political and religious animosity,—"Cursed is he who eateth swine's flesh, or teacheth his child Greek."[1]

Power, whether ecclesiastical or civil, is so liable to abuse, that it is not surprising that the Greeks, as soon as they had succeeded in transforming the established church of the Roman empire into the Greek church, should have acted unfairly to the provincial clergy of the eastern provinces of the empire, in which the Greek liturgy was not used: nor is it surprising that the national differences should have soon been identified with opposite opinions in points of doctrine. As soon as any question arose, the Greek clergy, from their

[1] Yet, even among the Jews, there was a government party who wished to introduce the use of the Greek Scriptures in the synagogues, and a reasonable party who wished the people to understand the Scriptures. "Vel etiam patria forte—Italica hac dicimus —lingua," &c.—*Justiniani Nov.* 146. *Auth. Const.* 125.

alliance with the State, and their possession of the ecclesiastical revenues of the Church, were sure of being orthodox; and the provincial clergy were in constant danger of being regarded as heterodox, merely because they were not Greeks. There can be no doubt that several of the national churches of the East owe some increase of their hostility to the Roman government to the circumstances adverted to. The sixth century gave strong proofs of the necessity that each country which possessed a language and literature should possess also its national church; and the struggle of the Roman empire and of the Greek ecclesiastical establishment against this attempt at national independence on the part of the Armenians, Syrians, Egyptians, Africans, and Italians, involved the empire in many difficulties, and opened a way, first for the Persians to push their invasions into the heart of the empire, and afterwards for the Mohammedans to conquer the eastern provinces, and virtually to put an end to the Roman power.

Section XI

State of Athens during the decline of paganism, and until the extinction of its schools by Justinian

Ancient Greek literature and Hellenic traditions expired at Athens in the sixth century. In the year 529 Justinian closed the schools of rhetoric and philosophy, and confiscated the property devoted to their support.[1] The measure was probably dictated by his determination to centralise all power and patronage at Constantinople in his own person; for the municipal funds appropriated annually by the Athenian magistrates to pay the salaries of public teachers could not have excited the cupidity of the emperor during the early part of his reign, while the imperial treasury was still overflowing with the savings of Anastasius and Justin. The conduct of the great lawgiver must have been the result of policy rather than of rapacity.

It seems to be generally supposed that Athens had dwindled into a small town; that its schools were frequented only by a few lazy pedants, and that the office of professor had become a sinecure before Justinian closed for ever the gates of the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Stoa, and allowed the last Athenian philosophers to wander to Persia in search of the

[1] Joan. Malales, 64, edit. Ven. Theophanes, 153. Agathias, ii. 30.

votaries they were no longer allowed to seek among the citizens of the Roman empire.[1] A passage of Synesius, who was compelled to touch at the port of the Piræus without having any desire to visit Athens, has been cited to prove the decay of learning, and the decline of population. The African philosopher says that the deserted aspect of the city of Minerva reminded him of the skin of an animal which had been sacrificed, and whose body had been consumed as an offering. Athens had nothing to boast of but great names. The Academy, the Lyceum, and the Stoa, were indeed still shown to travellers, but learning had forsaken these ancient retreats, and, instead of philosophers in the agora, you met only dealers in honey.[2] The Dorian prejudices of the Cyrenian, who boasted of his descent from Spartan kings, evidently overpowered the candour of the visitor. His spleen may have been caused by some neglect on the part of the Athenian literary aristocracy to welcome their distinguished guest, but it does little honour to the taste of Synesius that he could see the glorious spectacle of the Acropolis in the rich hue of its original splendour, and walk along surrounded by the many noble monuments of architecture, sculpture, and painting, which then adorned the city, without one expression of admiration. The time of his visit was not the most favourable for one who sought Athenian society, for it was only two years after the invasion of Alaric; but, after every allowance has been made for the peevishness of the writer, and for the deserted state of the city in consequence of the Gothic invasion, there exists ample proof that this description is a mere flourish of rhetorical exaggeration. History tells us that Athens prospered, and that her schools were frequented by many eminent men long after the ravages of Alaric and the visit of Synesius. The empress Eudocia (Athenaïs) was a year old, and Synesius might have seen in a nurse's arms the infant who received at Athens the education which made her one of the most accomplished and elegant ladies of a brilliant and luxurious court, as well as a person of learning, even without reference to her sex and rank.

Athens was not then a rude provincial town. St. John Chrysostom informs us that, in the court of Pulcheria's mother, a knowledge of dress, embroidery, and music, were

[1] *Cod. Just.* i. xi. 10. Procopius, *Arc. Hist.* 74, 77, edit. Par.
[2] *Synesii Epist.* 135. Gibbon, ch. xxx. note 8; Neander, ii. 84.—who both refer to this passage.

considered as the most important objects on which taste could be displayed; but that to converse with elegance, and to compose pretty verses, were regarded as necessary proofs of intellectual superiority.[1] Pulcheria, though born in this court, against which Chrysostom declaimed with eloquent but sometimes unseemly violence, lived the life of a saint. Yet she adopted the elegant heathen maiden Athenaïs as a protegée, and, when she converted her, bestowed on her the name of her own mother Eudocia. Though history tells us nothing of the fashionable society of Athens at this time, it supplies us with some interesting information concerning the social position of her learned men, and we know that they were generally gentlemen whose chief pride was that they were also scholars.

When the members of the native aristocracy in Greece found that they were excluded by the Romans from the civil and military service of the State, they devoted themselves to literature and philosophy. It became the tone of good society to be pedantic. The wealth and the fame of Herodes Atticus have rendered him the type of the Greek aristocratic philosophers.[2] The Emperor Hadrian had revived the importance and augmented the prosperity of Athens by his visits, and he gave additional consequence to its schools by appointing an official professor of the branch of learning called Sophistics. Lollianus, who first occupied this chair, was a native of Ephesus; but he was welcomed by the Athenians, for the strong remedies the Romans had applied to diminish their pride had at least cured them of the absurd vanity of autochthonism. Lollianus not only received the rights of citizenship, he was elected strategos, then the highest office in the local magistracy. During his term of service he employed his own wealth and his personal credit to alleviate the sufferings caused by a severe famine; and he discharged all the debts contracted for this purpose from his private fortune. The Athenians rewarded him for his generosity by erecting two statues to his memory.[3]

Antoninus Pius increased the public importance, and gave

1 See the Memoir on the manners of the age of Theodosius I. and Arcadius, which Montfaucon wrote while editing the works of Chrysostom.—*Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscrip.* xiii. 474.

2 See the Memoir on the Life of Herodes Atticus, by Burigny. *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscrip.* xxx. 1.

3 Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 225, edit. Kayser. Before the corn arrived, the people would have stoned their strategos if Pankratios the cynic had not turned aside their anger by asking them whether they did not know that the trade of Lollianus was to supply words, not bread.

an official character to the schools, by allowing the professors named by the emperor an annual salary of ten thousand drachmas.[1] Marcus Aurelius, who visited Athens on his return from the East after the rebellion of Avidius Cassius, established official teachers of every kind of learning there publicly taught, and organised the philosophers into an university. Scholarchs were appointed for the four great philosophical sects of the stoics, platonists, peripatetics, and epicureans, who received fixed salaries from the government.[2] The wealth and avarice of the Athenian philosophers became after this a common subject of envy and reproach. Many names of some eminence in literature might be cited as connected with the Athenian schools during the second and third centuries; but to show the universal character of the studies pursued, and the freedom of inquiry that was allowed, it is only necessary to mention the Christian writers Quadratus, Aristeides, and Athenagoras, who shared with their heathen contemporaries the fame and patronage of which Athens could dispose.

It appears that even before the end of the second century the population of the city had undergone a great change, in consequence of the constant immigration of Asiatic and Alexandrian Greeks who visited it in order to frequent its schools, and make use of its libraries. The attendants and followers of these wealthy strangers settled at Athens in such numbers as to modify the spoken dialect, which then lost its classic purity; and it was only in the depopulated demoi, and among the impoverished landed proprietors of Attica, who were too poor to purchase foreign slaves or to associate with wealthy sophists, that pure Attic Greek was any longer heard.[3] Strangers filled the chairs of eloquence and philosophy, and rhetoricians were elected to be the chief magistrates. In the third century, however, we find the Athenian Dexippus, a rhetorician, a patriot, and a historian, holding the highest offices in the local administration with honour to himself and to his country.[4]

Both Athens and the Piræus had completely recovered from the ravages committed by the Goths before the time of Constantine. The large crews which were embarked in ancient

[1] Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 245, edit. Kayser.
[2] Dion Cassius, lxxi. 31. Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 245. Lucian, *Eunuch.* 3. Ellisen, *Zur Geschichte Athens nach dem Verluste seiner Selbstandigkeit.*
[3] Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 238.
[4] *Corpus Script. Hist. Byz.*, "De Dexippo," p. xiv. edit. Bonn.

galleys, and the small space which they contained for the stowage of provisions, rendered it necessary to select a station well supplied either from its own resources or from its being a centre of commercial communication, in order to assemble a great naval force. The fact that Constantine selected the Piræus as the harbour at which his son Crispus concentrated the large force with which he defeated Licinius at the Hellespont, proves at least that the Athenian markets afforded abundant supplies of provisions.

The heathen city of Minerva enjoyed the favour and protection of the Christian emperors. Constantine continued the salaries of the scholarchs and professors. He enlarged their privileges, and exempted them from many onerous taxes and public burdens. He furnished the city with an annual supply of grain for distribution, and he accepted the title of strategos, as Hadrian had accepted that of archon, to show that he deemed it an honour to belong to its local magistrature.[1] Constantius granted a donative of grain to the city as a special mark of favour to Proæresius; and during his reign we find its schools extremely popular, crowded with wealthy students from every province of the empire, and attended by all the great men of the time.[2] Four celebrated men resided there nearly at the same period—the future Emperor Julian, the sophist Libanius, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nazianzenus. Athens then enjoyed the inestimable blessing of toleration. Heathens and Christians both frequented her schools unmolested, in spite of the laws already promulgated against some pagan rites, for the regulations against soothsayers and diviners were not supposed to be applicable to gentlemen and philosophers. Athenian society consequently suffered for some time very little from the changes which took place in the religious opinions of the emperors. It gained nothing from the heathenism of Julian, and lost nothing by the Arianism of Valens.

Julian, it is true, ordered all the temples to be repaired, and regular sacrifices to be performed with order and pomp; but his reign was too short to effect any considerable change, and his orders met with little attention in Greece, for Christianity had already made numerous converts among the priests of the temples, who, strange to say, appear to have embraced the

1 Julian, *Orat. in Laud. Constantii*, p. 8, edit. Spanheim. Eunapius, *Vit. Soph.* 22, edit. Boissonade. *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 3, 1 and 3.
2 Eunapius, *Vit. Soph.* 90, edit. Boissonade.

doctrines of Christianity much more readily and promptly than the philosophers. Many priests had already been converted to Christianity with their whole families, and in many temples it was difficult to procure the celebration of the heathen ceremonies.[1] Julian attempted to inflict one serious wound on Christianity at Athens, by issuing an unjust and arbitrary edict forbidding Christians from giving instruction publicly in rhetoric and literature. By this law he believed that it would be in his power to reduce the Christians to a state of ignorance. His respect for the character of Proæresius, an Armenian, who was then a professor at Athens, induced him to exempt that teacher from his ordinance; but Proæresius refused to avail himself of the emperor's permission, for, as new ceremonies were prescribed in the resorts of public teaching, he considered it his duty to cease lecturing rather than appear tacitly to conform to heathen usages.[2]

The supremacy of paganism was of short duration. About two years after Julian had proclaimed it the established religion of the Roman empire, Valentinian and Valens published an edict forbidding incantations, magical ceremonies, and offerings by night, under pain of death.[3] The application of this law, according to the letter, would have prevented the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries, and rendered life intolerable to many fervid votaries of Hellenic superstition, and of the Neo-platonic philosophy. The suppression of the great heathen festivals, of which some of the rites were celebrated during the night, would have seriously injured the prosperity of Athens, and some other cities in Greece. The celebrated Prætextatus, a heathen highly esteemed for his integrity and administrative talents, was then proconsul of Achaia. His representations induced the emperors to make some necessary modifications in the application of the edict, and the Eleusinian mysteries continued to be celebrated until Alaric destroyed the temple.[4]

Paganism rapidly declined, but the heathen philosophers at Athens continued to live as a separate class of society, refusing to embrace Christianity, though without offering any opposition to its progress. They considered their own religious opinions

[1] *Panegyrici Veteres. Mamertini gratiarum actio Juliano*, c. 9: quoted by Zinkeisen, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, p. 621. The priests had begun to forget or to neglect the ancient rites in the time of Apollonius of Tyana.—Philostratus, iii. 58.

[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, xxv. 4. See the article "Proæresius," in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* ix. 16, 7. A.D. 364.

[4] Zosimus, iv. 3. Lasaulx, *Der Untergang des Hellenismus*, p. 84, note 242.

as too elevated for the vulgar, so that there existed no community of feeling between the aristocratic Neo-platonists of the schools, the burgesses of the towns, whether they were heathens or Christians, and the agriculturists in the country, who were generally pagans. Hence the emperors entertained no political dislike to the philosophers, and continued to employ them in the public service. Neither Christian emperors nor Christian bishops felt any rancour against the amiable scholars who cherished the exclusive prejudices of Hellenic civilisation, and who considered the philanthropic spirit of Christianity as an idle dream. The Neo-platonists viewed man as by nature a brutal creature, and they deemed slavery to be the proper condition of the labouring classes. They scorned equally the rude idolatry of corrupted paganism, and the simple doctrines of pure Christianity. They were deeply imbued with those social prejudices which have for centuries separated the rural and urban population in the East; prejudices which were first created by the prevalence of predial slavery, but which were greatly increased by the fiscal system of the Romans, which enthralled men to degraded employment in hereditary castes. Libanius, Themistius, and Symmachus, were favoured even by the orthodox emperor Theodosius the Great. St. Basil corresponded with Libanius. Musonius, who had taught rhetoric at Athens, was imperial governor of Asia in the year 367; but, as it is possible that he had then embraced Christianity, this circumstance can only be cited to prove the social rank still maintained by the teachers of the Athenian schools.[1]

The last breath of Hellenic life was now rapidly passing away, and its dissolution conferred no glory on Greece. The Olympic games were celebrated until the reign of Theodosius I. The last recorded victor was an Armenian. Alexander, son of Amyntas, king of Macedon, had not been allowed to become a competitor for a prize until he had proved his Hellenic descent; but the Hellenes were at this time prouder of being Romaioi than of being Greeks, and the Armenian Varastad, whose name closes the long list which commences with demi-gods, and is filled with heroes, was a Romaios.[2] Hellenic art also fled from the soil of Hellas. The chrys-elephantine statue of the Olympian Jupiter was transported to

1 Clinton, *Fasti Romani*. See Musonius, and the citations relating to him.

2 Moses Chorenensis, iii. 40, cited by Lasaulx, note 310. The suppression of the Olympic games, overlooked by Clinton (*Fasti Romani*), is mentioned by Cedrenus, i. 326. A.D. 394 (?)

Constantinople, where it was destroyed in one of the gre
fires which so often laid waste that city. The statue
Minerva, which the pagans believed had protected h
favourite city against Alaric, was carried off about the san
time, and thus the two great works of Phidias were exil
from Greece.[1] The destruction of the great temple of Olym
pia followed soon after, but the exact date is unknown. Son
have supposed that it was burned by the Gothic troops
Alaric; others think that it was destroyed by Christian bigot
in the reign of Theodosius II. The Olympiads, which f
generation after generation had served to record the nob
emulation of the Greeks, were now supplanted by the notatio
of the indiction. Glory resigned her influence over society
taxation.

The restrictions which Julian had placed on public instru
tion in order to acquire the power of injuring Christianity, ha
not been productive of permanent effects.[2] Theodosius II
was the first emperor who interfered with public instructio
for the direct object of controlling and circumscribi
public opinion. While he honoured those professors wh
were appointed by his own authority, and propagated th
principles of submission, or rather of servility, to the imperi
commands, he struck a mortal blow at the spirit of free inquir
by forbidding private teachers to give public lectures unde
pain of infamy and banishment.[3] Private teachers of philo
ophy had hitherto enjoyed great freedom in teaching through
out Greece; but henceforth thought was enslaved even
Athens, and no opinions were allowed to be taught excep
such as could obtain a license from the imperial authoritie
Emulation was destroyed, and genius, which is always regarde
with suspicion by men of routine, for it sheds new light eve
on the oldest subject, was now officially suppressed. Me
not having the liberty of uttering their thoughts soon cease
to think.

Though we are acquainted with very few precise fact
relating to the state of society in Athens from the time
Theodosius II. to the suppression of the schools of philosoph
by Justinian, we are, nevertheless, able to form some idea

[1] Marinus, *Vit. Procli.* c. 29, 30, edit. Boissonade; cited by Chastel, *Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme dans l'Empire d'Orient*, p. 235. See the description of th statue of Minerva in Codinus, *De Orig. Constant.* p. 13. Other statues were carried from Athens to adorn Constantinople in the time of Theodosius II.—See Codinus, p. 32, edit. Par.

[2] *Cod. Just.* xiii. 3, 5; x. 52, 7.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* xiv. 9, 3; *Cod. Just.* xi. 18, 1.

e peculiarities which distinguished it from the other pro-ncial cities of the empire. The privileges and usages trans-itted from the time when Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius :ated Athens as a free city, were long tolerated by the ıristian emperors. Some Hellenic pride was still nourished Athens, from the tradition of its having been long an ally d not a subject of Rome. A trace of this memory of the st seems discernible in the speech of the Empress Eudocia the people of Antioch, as she was on her pilgrimage to rusalem. It closed with a boast of their common Hellenic igin.[1] The spirit of emulation between the votaries of the ɔspel and the schools undoubtedly tended to improve the ɔrality of Athens. Paganism, after it had been driven from ɔ mind, survived in the manners of the people in most of ɔ great cities of the empire. But at Athens the philoso-ers distinguished themselves by purity of morals; and the ıristians would have been ashamed in their presence of the hibitions of tumult and simony which disgraced the ecclesi-:ical elections at Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople. the mean time, the civilisation of the ancient world was t extinct, though many of its vices were banished. Public tels for strangers existed on the model which the Moham-:dans have gained so much honour by imitating; alms-uses for the destitute, and hospitals for the sick, were to be ınd in due proportion to the population, or the want would ve been justly recorded to the disgrace of the wealthy gans. The truth is, that the spirit of Christianity had pene-ted into heathenism, which had become virtuous and obtrusive, as well as mild and timid. The habits of henian society were soft and humane; the wealthy lived in laces, and purchased libraries. Many philosophers, like ɔclus, enjoyed ample revenues, and perhaps, like him, :eived rich legacies.[2] Ladies wore dresses of silk em-ɔidered with gold. Both sexes delighted in boots of thick ɛ ornamented with tassels of gold fringe. The luxurious ınk wine of Cnidus and Thasos, as we find attested by the in-ibed handles of broken amphoræ still scattered in the fields ınd the modern city.[3] The luxury and folly against which ırysostom declaimed at Constantinople were perhaps not known at Athens, but, as there was less wealth, vice could

1 Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 20.
2 Chastel, *Hist. de la Destruction du Paganisme*, 260.
3 Those of Rhodes are rarely of a late period.

not exhibit itself so shamelessly in the philosophic as in th orthodox city. It is not probable that the Bishop of Athe found it necessary to preach against ladies swimming in publ cisterns, which excited the indignation of the saint at Cor stantinople, and which continued to be a favourite amusemer of the fair sex for several generations, until Justinian sup pressed it by admitting it as a ground of divorce.[1]

Theodosius I., Arcadius, and Theodosius II., passed man laws prohibiting the ceremonies of paganism, and ordering th persecution of its votaries. It appears that many of th aristocracy, and even some men in high official employmen long adhered to its delusions. Optatus, the prefect of Cor stantinople in 404, was a heathen. Isokasios, questor c Antioch, was accused of the same crime in 467; and Tr bonian, the celebrated jurist of Justinian, who died in 54 was supposed to be attached to philosophic opinions hostile t Christianity, though he made no scruple in conforming ou wardly to the established religion. His want of religiou principle caused him to be called an atheist.[2] The philosopher were at last persecuted with great cruelty, and anecdotes ar related of their martyrdom in the reign of Zeno.[3] Phocas a patrician, poisoned himself in the reign of Justinian to avoi being compelled to embrace Christianity, or suffer death as criminal.[4] Yet the most celebrated historians of this perio were heathens. Of Eunapius and Zosimus there is no doubt and the general opinion refuses to regard Procopius as Christian.

At last, in the year 529, Justinian confiscated all the fund devoted to philosophic instruction at Athens, closed the schools, and seized the endowments of the academy of Plato which had maintained an uninterrupted succession of teacher for nine hundred years. The last teacher enjoyed an annua revenue of one thousand gold solidi, but it is probable that h wandered in a deserted grove, and lectured in an empty hall.[5] Seven Athenian philosophers are celebrated for exiling them selves to Persia, where they were sure to escape the persecu

[1] Montfaucon, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscrip.* xiii. 482. *Cod. Just.* v. 17, 9 This state of manners renders the picture of Theodora's conduct, and that of her com panions, as given by Procopius, evidence concerning the state of society, though it may be individually calumnious.

[2] Suidas, ii. 1204, edit. Bernhardi.

[3] Lasaulx, 140. Suidas, Ἱεροκλῆς, i. 953, edit. Bernh.

[4] Lasaulx, 147.

[5] The same property yielded only three gold pieces in the time of Plato. Suidas, Πλάτων, ii. 297, edit. Bernh.

tions of Justinian, and where they hoped to find disciples. But they met with no sympathy among the followers of Zoroaster, and they were soon happy to avail themselves of the favour of Chosroes, who obtained for them permission to return and spend their lives in peace in the Roman empire.[1] Toleration rendered their declining influence utterly insignificant, and the last heathen fancies of the philosophic schools disappeared from the conservative aristocracy, where they had found their last asylum.[2]

1 Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, ii. 84.

2 Clinton, *Fasti Romani*. A.D. 529–531. Agathias (69, edit. Par.) gives the names of the seven philosophers. Simplicius is the best known. Clinton (*Fasti Romani*, Appendix) furnishes us with lists of their writings.

Justinian considered Athens as a city of so much importance that he sent it a copy of his laws. See before, page 218, note.

CHAPTER IV

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE DEATH O JUSTINIAN TO THE RESTORATION OF ROMA POWER IN THE EAST BY HERACLIUS. A.D. 565-6

The reign of Justin II.—Disorganisation of all political and natio influence during the reigns of Tiberius II. and Maurice—Maur causes a revolution, by attempting to re-establish the ancient author of the imperial administration—Phocas was the representative of revolution, not of a national party—The empire under Heraclius Change in the position of the Greek population, produced by t Sclavonic establishments in Dalmatia—Influence of the campaigns Heraclius in the East—Condition of the native population of Greec

SECTION I

THE REIGN OF JUSTIN II.

THE history of the Roman empire assumes a new aspe during the period which elapsed between the deaths Justinian and of Heraclius. The mighty nation, which t union of the Macedonians and Greeks had formed in t greater part of the East, was rapidly declining, and in ma provinces hastening to extinction. Even the Hellenic race Europe, which had for many centuries displayed the appe ance of a people closely united by feelings, language, a religion, was in many districts driven from its ancient seats an emigration of a rude Sclavonian population. Helle civilisation, and all the fruits of the policy of Alexander t Great, had at last succumbed to Roman oppression. T people of Hellas directed their exclusive attention to th own local and religious institutions. They expected no bene from the imperial government; and the emperor and the a ministration of the empire could now give but little attenti to any provincial business, not directly connected with the a absorbing topic of the fiscal exigencies of the State.

The inhabitants of the various provinces of the Rom empire were everywhere forming local and religious asso tions, independent of the general government, and striving recur as rarely as possible to the central administration Constantinople. National feelings daily exerted additio

force in separating the subjects of the empire into communities, where language and religious opinions operated with more power on society than the political allegiance enforced by the emperor. This separation of the interests and feelings soon put an end to every prospect of regenerating the empire, and even presented momentary views of new political, religious, and national combinations, which seemed to threaten the immediate dissolution of the Eastern Empire. The history of the West offered the counterpart of the fate which threatened the East; and, according to all human calculations, Armenia, Syria, Egypt, Africa, and Hellas, were on the point of becoming independent states. But the inexorable principle of Roman centralisation possessed an inherent energy of existence very different from the unsettled republicanism of Greece, or the personality of the Macedonian monarchies. The Roman empire never relaxed its authority over its own subjects, nor did it ever cease to dispense to them an equal administration of justice, in every case in which its own fiscal demands were not directly concerned, and even then it authorised injustice by positive law. It never permitted its subjects to bear arms, unless those arms were received from the State, and directed by the emperor's officers; and when the imperial forces were defeated by the Avars and the Persians, its pride was unconquered. The emperors displayed the same spirit when the enemy was encamped before Constantinople as the senate had shown when Hannibal marched from the field of Cannæ to the walls of Rome.

Events which no human sagacity could foresee, against which no political wisdom could contend, and which the philosopher can only explain by attributing them to the dispensation of that Providence who exhibits, in the history of the world, the progress of the education of the whole human species, at last put an end to the existence of the Roman domination in a large part of its dominions in the East. Yet the inhabitants of the countries freed from the Roman yoke, instead of finding a freer range for the improvement of their individual and national advantages, found that the religion of Mahomet, and the victories of his followers, strengthened the power of despotism and bigotry; and many of the nations which had been enslaved by the Macedonians, and oppressed by the Romans, were exterminated by the Saracens.

The Roman emperors of the East appear to have fancied that the strict administration of justice in civil and criminal

affairs superseded the necessity of carefully watching the ordinary proceedings of the government officers in the administrative department, forgetting that the legal establishment could only take cognisance of the exceptional cases, and that the well-being of the people depended on the daily conduct of their civil governors. It soon became apparent that Justinian's reforms in the legislation of the empire had produced no improvement in the civil administration. That portion of the population of the capital, and of the empire, which arrogated to itself the title of Romans, turned the privileges conferred by their rank in the imperial service into a means of living at the expense of the people. But the emperor began to perceive that the central administration had lost some of its former control over the people; and Justin II. seemed willing to make the concessions necessary to revive the feeling that civil order, and security of property, flowed, as a natural result from the mere existence of the imperial government,—a feeling which had long contributed powerfully to support the throne of the emperors.[1]

The want of a fixed order of succession in the Roman empire was an evil severely felt, and the enactment of precise rules for the hereditary transmission of the imperial dignity would have been a wise and useful addition to the *lex regia*, or constitution of the State.[2] This constitution was supposed to have delegated the legislative power to the emperor; for the theory, that the Roman people was the legitimate source of all authority, still floated in public opinion. Justinian, however, was sufficiently versed both in the laws and constitutional forms of the empire, to dread any precise qualification of the vague and perhaps imaginary law; though the interests of the empire imperiously required that measures should be adopted to prevent the throne from becoming an object of civil war

[1] The Novell cxlix. is ascribed to Justin. It is altogether a curious document for the illustration of the history of his reign. The following passage is worthy of attention: "Hortamur cujusque provinciæ sanctissimos episcopos, eos etiam qui inter possessores et incolas principatum tenent, ut per communem supplicationem ad potestiam nostram eos deferant, quos ad administrationem provinciæ suæ idoneos existiment."—*Ed. Just.* iv.

[2] "Sed et, quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem; cum lex regia quæ de ejus imperio lata est, populus ei, et in eum, omne imperium suum et potestatem concedat."—Just. *Inst.* i. 2, 6. This *lex regia* alluded to by Justinian was therefore equivalent to an act of parliament, vesting the legislative power in the Crown, but it cannot have been unconnected in the opinion of the Romans with the *lex curiata de imperio*, which conferred the sovereignty on Romulus. It indicated that the commonwealth whose will was expressed in this law, was something greater than the emperor; and in consequence of this feeling, the Romans always, even under the empire, regarded themselves as a free people, over whom the law was the sovereign authority.

A successor is apt to be a rival, and a regency in the Roman empire would have revived the power of the senate, and probably converted the government into an oligarchical aristocracy. Justinian, as he was childless, naturally felt unwilling to circumscribe his own power by any positive law, lest he should create a claim which the authority of the senate and people of Constantinople might have found the means of enforcing, and thus a legal control over the arbitrary exercise of the imperial power would have been established. A doubtful succession was also an event viewed with satisfaction by most of the leading men in the senate, the palace, and the army, as they might expect to advance their private fortunes, during the period of intrigue and uncertainty inseparable from such a contingency. The partisans of a fixed succession would only be found among the lawyers of the capital, the clergy, and the civil and financial administrators in the provinces; for the Roman citizens and nobility, forming a privileged class, were generally averse to the project, as tending to diminish their importance. The abolition of the ceremony attending the sanction of the emperor's election by the senate and the people, would have been viewed as an arbitrary change in the constitution, and as an attempt to rob the inhabitants of the Eastern Empire of the boast "that they lived under a legal monarch, and not under a hereditary despot like the Persians,"—a boast which they still uttered with pride.

The death of Justinian had so long threatened the empire with civil war, that all parties were anxious to avert the catastrophe; and Justin, one of his nephews, who held the office of master of the palace, was peaceably installed as his uncle's successor. The energy of his personal character enabled him to turn to his advantage the traces of ancient forms that still survived in the Roman state; and the momentary political importance thus given to these forms, serves to explain to us that the Roman government was even then very far from a pure despotism. The phrase, "the senate, and the Roman people," still exerted so much influence over public opinion, that Justin considered their formal election as constituting his legal title to the throne. The senate was instructed by his partisans to solicit him to accept the imperial dignity, though he had already secured both the troops and the treasury; and the people were assembled in the hippodrome, in order to enable the new emperor to deliver an oration, in which he assured them that their happiness, and not his own repose, should

always be the chief object of his government.[1] The charact of Justin II. was honourable, but it is said to have bee capricious; he was, however, neither destitute of perso abilities nor energy.[2] Disease, and temporary fits of insanit compelled him at last to resign the direction of public busine to others, and in this critical conjuncture his choice displaye both judgment and patriotism. He passed over his ow brothers and his son-in-law, in order to select the man wh appeared alone capable of re-establishing the fortunes of th Roman empire by his talents. This man was Tiberius II.

The commencement of Justin's reign was marked by vigou perhaps even by rashness. He considered the annual subsidie paid by Justinian to the Persians and the Avars in the light a disgraceful tribute, and, as he refused to make any farthe payments, he was involved in war with both these powerfu enemies at the same time. Yet, so inconsistent was th Roman administration, that the Lombards, by no means powerful or numerous people, were allowed to conquer th greater part of Italy almost unopposed. As this conquest wa the first military transaction that occurred during his reign, an as the Lombards occupy an important place in the history o European civilisation, the loss of Italy has been usuall selected as a convincing proof of the weakness and incapacit of Justin.

The country occupied by the Lombards on the Danube wa exhausted by their oppressive rule; and they found great diff culty in maintaining their position, in consequence of th neighbourhood of the Avars, the growing strength of th Sclavonians, and the perpetual hostility of the Gepids. Th diminished population and increasing poverty of the surroun ing countries no longer supplied the means of supporting numerous body of warriors in that contempt for every usefu occupation which was essential to the preservation of th national superiority of the Gothic race. The Sclavonic neigh bours and subjects of the Gothic tribes were gradual becoming as well armed as their masters; and as many o those neighbours combined the pursuits of agriculture wit their pastoral and predatory habits, they were slowly rising to

[1] Corippus, *De Laud. Justini Minoris*, l. ii. v. 337. Constantine Porphyrogenitu *De Ceremoniis Aulæ Byzantinæ*, i. c. 93. vol. i. p. 422. edit. Bonn. Justin say Τῇ τοῦ πανταδυνάμου, Θεοῦ κρίσει, τῇ τε ὑμετέρᾳ κοινῇ ἐκλογῇ πρὸς τ βασιλείαν χωρήσαντες, τὴν οὐράνιον πρόνοιαν ἐπικαλούμεθα. His principles administration are also developed in the *Novells*, cxlviii. and cxlix.

[2] Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 208.

national equality. Pressed by these circumstances, Alboin, king of the Lombards, resolved to emigrate, and to effect a settlement in Italy, the richest and most populous country in his neighbourhood. To secure himself during the expedition, he proposed to the Avars to unite their forces and destroy the kingdom of the Gepids, agreeing to abandon all claims to the conquered country, and to remain satisfied with half the movable spoil.

This singular alliance was successful: the united forces of the Lombards and Avars overpowered the Gepids, and destroyed their kingdom in Pannonia, which had existed for one hundred and fifty years. The Lombards immediately commenced their emigration. The Heruls had already quitted this desolated country, and thus the last remains of the Gothic race, which had lingered on the confines of the Eastern Empire, abandoned their possessions to the Hunnic tribes, which they had long successfully opposed, and to the Sclavonians, whom they had for ages ruled.

The historians of this period, on the authority of Paul the Deacon, a Lombard chronicler, have asserted that Narses invited the Lombards into Italy in order to avenge an insulting message with which the empress Sophia had accompanied an order of her husband Justin for the recall of the ancient eunuch to Constantinople.[1] The court was dissatisfied with the expense of Narses in the administration of Italy, and required that the province should remit a larger sum to the imperial treasury than it had hitherto done. The Italians, on the other hand, complained of the military severity and fiscal oppression of his government. The last acts of the life of Narses are, however, quite incompatible with treasonable designs; and probably the knowledge which the emperor Justin and his cabinet must have possessed of the impossibility of deriving any surplus revenue from the agricultural districts of Italy, offers the simplest explanation of the indifference manifested at Constantinople to the Lombard invasion. It would be apparently nearer the truth to affirm that the Lombards entered Italy with the tacit sanction of the empire, than that Narses acted as a traitor.

As soon as Narses received the order of recall, he proceeded to Naples, on his way to Constantinople; but the advance of

1 Paulus Diaconus, *De Gestis Langobardorum*, iii. 5. The Lombards were accompanied by twenty thousand Saxons, who were defeated by the Burgundians in the Valais.

the Lombards alarmed the Italians to such a degree, that they despatched a deputation to beg him to resume the government. The Bishop of Rome repaired to Naples, to persuade Narses of the sincere repentance of the provincials, who now perceived the danger of losing a ruler of talent at such a crisis. No suspicion, therefore, could have then prevailed amongst the Italians of any communications between Narses and the Lombards, nor could they have suspected that an experienced courtier, a wise statesman, and an able general, would, in his extreme old age, allow revenge to get the better of his reason; else they would have trembled at his return to power, and dreaded his vengeance instead of confiding in his talents. And even in examining history at this distance of time, we ought certainly to weigh the conduct and character of a long public life against the dramatic tale of an empress sending to a viceroy a grossly insulting message, and the improbability that the viceroy should publicly proclaim his thirst for revenge. The story that the empress Sophia sent a distaff and spindle to the ablest soldier in the empire, and that the veteran should have declared in his passion that he would spin her a thread which she should not easily unravel, seems a fable, which bears a character of fancy and of simplicity of ideas, marking its origin in a ruder state of society than that which reigned at the court of Justin II. A Gothic or Lombard origin of the fable is farther supported by the fact, that it must have produced no ordinary sensation among the Germanic nations to see a eunuch invested with the highest commands in the army and the State, and the sensation could not fail to give rise to many idle tales. The story of Narses's treason may have arisen at the time of his death; but it is remarkable that no Greek author mentions it before the tenth century; and what is still more extraordinary, and countenances in some degree the inference of at least tacit consent on the part of the Roman emperor, is the fact, that no earlier account of the conquest of Italy by the Lombards occurs in any Greek writer.[1] Narses really accepted the invitation of the Italians to return to Rome, where he commenced the necessary preparations for resisting the Lombards, but his death occurred before their arrival in Italy.

[1] A.D. 949. Constantine Porph. *De Adm. Imperio*, 17. The emperor's extreme want of exactness in his account of this event, proves that he had no authentic document to copy. It confounds chronology and persons; mentions an empress Irene, and a patriarch Zacharias the Athenian, as cotemporaries of Narses, and never names the emperor Justin. See Banduri's Note, vol. iii. p. 331, edit. Bonn.

The historians of Justin's reign are full of complaints of the abuses which had infected the administration of justice, yet the facts which they record tend distinctly to exculpate the emperor from any fault, and prove incontestably that the corruption had its seat in the vices of the whole system of the civil government of the empire. The most remarkable anecdote selected to illustrate the corruption of the judicial department, indicates that the real cause of the disorder lay in the increasing power of the official aristocracy connected with the civil administration. A man of rank, on being cited before the prefect of the city for an act of injustice, ridiculed the summons, and excused himself from appearing to answer it, as he was engaged to attend an entertainment given by the emperor.[1] In consideration of this circumstance, the prefect did not venture to arrest him; but he proceeded immediately to the palace, entered the state apartments, and addressing Justin, declared that, as a judge, he was ready to execute every law for the strict administration of justice, but since the emperor honoured criminals, by admitting them to the imperial table, where his authority was of no avail, he begged to be allowed to resign his office. Justin, without hesitation, asserted that he would never defend any act of injustice, and that even should he himself be the person accused, he would submit to be punished. The prefect, thus authorised, seized the accused, and carried him to his court for trial. The emperor applauded the conduct of his judge; but this act of energy is said to have so completely astonished the inhabitants of Constantinople, that, for thirty days, no accusation was brought before the prefect. This effect of the impartial administration of justice on the people seems strange, if the historians of the period are correct in their complaints of the general injustice. The anecdote is, however, valuable, as it reveals the real cause of the duration of the Eastern Empire, and shows that the crumbling political edifice was sustained by the judicial administration. Justin also paid every attention to relieve his subjects from the burden which the arrears of the public taxes were always causing to the people, without enriching the treasury.[2]

If Justin engaged rashly in a quarrel with Persia, he

[1] Μάγιστρός τις. Cedrenus, vol. i. 389. Τῶν ἐπισημοτέρων συγκλητικων ἕνα. Zonaras, ii. 71. Manasses, *Chron.* p. 69.

[2] See *Novell.* cxlviii. and cxlix., both ascribed to Justin. Also *Novell.* cxli. of Tiberius, who says, "Ab avaritia eorum, qui magistratus emunt magis, quam accipiunt."

certainly omitted no means of strengthening himself during the contest. He formed alliances with the Turks of central Asia, and with the Ethiopians who occupied a part of Arabia; but, in spite of his allies, the arms of the empire were unsuccessful in the East. A long series of predatory excursions were carried on by the Romans and the Persians, and many provinces of both empires were reduced to a state of desolation by this barbarous species of warfare. Chosroes succeeded in capturing Dara, the bulwark of Mesopotamia, and in ravishing Syria in the most terrible manner; half a million of the inhabitants of this flourishing province were carried away as slaves into Persia. In the meantime the Avars consolidated their empire on the Danube, by compelling the Huns, Bulgarians, Sclavonians, and the remains of the Goths, to submit to their authority. Justin vainly attempted to arrest their career, by encouraging the Franks of Austrasia to attack them. The Avars continued their war with the empire, and defeated the Roman army under Tiberius the future emperor.

The misfortunes which assailed the empire on every side, and the increasing difficulties of the internal administration, demanded exertions, of which the health of Justin rendered him incapable. Tiberius seemed the only man competent to guide the vessel of the State through the storm, and Justin had the magnanimity to name him as successor, with the dignity of Cæsar, and the sense to commit to him the entire control over the public administration. The conduct of the Cæsar soon changed the fortune of war in the East, though the European provinces were still abandoned to the ravages of the Sclavonians.[1] Chosroes was defeated at Melitene, though he commanded his army in person, and the Romans, pursuing their success, penetrated into Babylonia, and plundered all the provinces of Persia to the very shores of the Caspian Sea.

It is surprising that we find no mention of the Greeks, people, nor of Greece itself, in the memorials of the reign of Justin. Justinian had plundered Greece of as large a portion of her revenues as he could; Justin and his successors utterly neglected her defence against the Sclavonian incursions, yet it appears that the Greeks contrived still to retain so much of their ancient spirit of independence and their exclusive nationality, as to awaken a feeling of jealousy amongst that more aristocratic portion of their nation which assumed the

[1] Menander, pp. 124, 164, edit. Paris; 327, 404, edit. Bonn.

Roman name. That the imperial government overlooked no trace of nationality among any section of its subjects, is evident from a law which Justin passed to enforce the conversion of the Samaritans to Christianity, and which apparently was successful in exterminating that people, as, though they previously occupied almost as important a place in the history of the Eastern Empire as the Jews, they cease to be mentioned from the time of Justin's law.[1]

Section II

Disorganisation of all political and national influence during the reigns of Tiberius II. and Maurice

The reigns of Tiberius and Maurice present the remarkable spectacle of two princes, of no ordinary talents, devoting all their energies to improve the condition of their country, without being able to arrest its decline, though that decline evidently proceeded from internal causes. Great evils arose in the Roman empire from the discord existing between the government and almost every class of its subjects. A powerful army still kept the field, the administration was perfectly arranged, the finances were not in a state of disorder, and every exertion was made to enforce the strictest administration of justice; yet, with so many elements of good government, the government was bad, unpopular, and oppressive. No feeling of patriotism existed in any class; no bond of union united the monarch and his subjects; and no ties of common interest rendered their public conduct amenable to the same laws. No fundamental institution of a national character enforced the duties of a citizen by the bonds of morality and religion; and thus the emperors could only apply administrative reforms as a cure for an universal political palsy. Great hopes of improvement were, however, entertained when Tiberius mounted the throne; for his prudence, justice, and talents, were the theme of general admiration. He opposed the enemies of the empire with vigour, but as he saw that the internal ills of the State were infinitely more dangerous than the Persians and the Avars, he made peace the great object of his exertions, in order that he might devote his exclusive attention and the whole power of the empire to the reform of the civil and military administration. But he solicited peace from

[1] A.D. 572. *Novell.* cxliv.

Hormisdas, the son of Chosroes, in vain. When he found a reasonable terms of accommodation rejected by the Persian he attempted, by a desperate effort, to terminate the war. Th whole disposable military force of the empire was collected i Asia Minor, and an army of one hundred and fifty thousan men was, by this means, assembled. The Avars were allowe to seize Sirmium, and the emperor consented to conclude wit them an inglorious and disadvantageous peace, so importan did it appear to him to secure success in the struggle wit Persia. The war commenced with some advantage, but th death of Tiberius interrupted all his plans. He died afte a short reign of four years, with the reputation of being th best sovereign who had ever ruled the Eastern Empire, and h bequeathed to his son-in-law Maurice the difficult task o carrying into execution his extensive schemes of reform.

Maurice was personally acquainted with every branch of th public administration—he possessed all the qualities of an excel lent minister—he was a humane and honourable man,—but h wanted the great sagacity necessary to rule the Roman empir in the difficult times in which he reigned. His private characte merited all the eulogies of the Greek historians, for he was good man and a true Christian. When the people of Constanti nople and their bigoted patriarch determined to burn an un fortunate individual as a magician, he made every effort, thoug in vain, to save the persecuted man.[1] He gave a feeling proo of the sincerity of his faith after his dethronement; for when th child of another was offered to the executioners instead of his own, he himself revealed the error, lest an innocent perso should perish by his act. He was orthodox in his religion, an economical in his expenditure, virtues which his subjects were well qualified to appreciate, and much inclined to admire The one ought to have endeared him to the people, and th other to the clergy; but unfortunately, his want of success i war was connected with his parsimony, and his humanity was regarded as less orthodox than Christian. The impressio of his virtues was thus neutralised, and he could never secure to his government the great political advantages which he might have derived from popularity. As soon as his reign proved unfortunate he was called a miser and a Marcionite.[2]

By supporting the Bishop of Constantinople in his assump

[1] Theophylactus Simocatta, *Hist.* i. xi. Evagrius, vi. 2.

[2] The Marcionites held, that an intermediate deity of a mixed nature, neither per fectly good nor perfectly evil, is the creator of the world.—Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*.

tion of the title of œcumenical patriarch, Maurice excited the violent animosity of Pope Gregory I.; and the great reputation of that sagacious pontiff has induced Western historians to examine all the actions of the Eastern emperor through a veil of ecclesiastical prejudice. Gregory, in his letters, accuses Maurice of supporting the venality of the public administration, and even of selling the high office of exarch. These accusations are doubtless correct enough when applied to the system of the Byzantine court; but no prince seems to have felt more deeply than Maurice the evil effects of that system, or made sincerer efforts to reform it. That personal avarice was not the cause of the financial errors of his administration, is attested by numerous instances of his liberality recorded in history, and from the fact that even during his turbulent reign he was intent on reducing the public burdens of his subjects, and actually succeeded in his plans to a considerable extent.[1] The flatteries heaped by Gregory the Great on the worthless tyrant Phocas, show clearly enough that policy, not justice, regulated the measure of the pope's praise and censure.

Maurice had been selected by Tiberius as his confidential agent in the projects adopted for the reform of the army; and much of the new emperor's misfortune originated from attempting to carry into execution plans which required the calm judgment, and the elevation of character, of their author, in order to create throughout the empire the feeling that their adoption was necessary for the salvation of the Roman power. The enormous expense of the army, and the independent existence, unaffected by any national feeling, which it maintained, now compromised the safety of the government, as much as it had done before the reforms of Constantine. Tiberius had begun cautiously to lay the foundation of a new system, by adding to his household troops a corps of fifteen thousand heathen slaves, whom he purchased and disciplined.[2]

1 Theophylactus Simocatta says that Maurice reduced the taxes one-third, but the assertion is too general to induce us to admit that so important a change could remain unnoticed by every other authority. The phrase almost warrants the inference that a remission of arrears was the concession accorded by the emperor, but only a Byzantine panegyrist could ascribe any great merit to the remission of one-third of a bad debt. Ἀναφέρεται δὲ καὶ τὴν τρίτην μοίραν τῶν φόρων συγχωρῆσαι τοῖς ὑπηκόοις τὸν βασιλέα Μαυρίκιον.—lib. viii. 13.

2 Theophanes, *Chron.* 213. The words of Theophanes show that this corps perfectly resembled the Janissaries in their earliest organisation, and adds another to the many examples already noticed, of the powerful influence exercised on the policy of the rulers of Constantinople by the singular position of that city, both political and geographical. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Τιβέριος ἀγοράσας σώματα ἐθνικῶν, κατέστησε στράτευμα εἰς ὄνομα ἴδιον ἀμφίασας καὶ καθοπλίσας αὐτούς. The formation of this corps of slaves indicates the isolated position and the irresponsible power of the

He placed this little army under the immediate command c
Maurice, who had already displayed an attachment to militar
reforms, by attempting to restore the ancient mode of encamp
ing Roman armies. This taste for improvements appears t
have created a feeling of dissatisfaction in the army, and ther
seems every reason to ascribe the unsuccessful operations c
Maurice on the Iberian frontier, in the year 580, to a feelin
of discontent among the soldiers.[1] That he was a militar
pedant, may be inferred from the fact that he found time t
write a work on military tactics, without succeeding in acquir
ing a great military reputation; and it is certain that he wa
suspected by the soldiers of being an enemy to the privileges
and pretensions of the army, and that by them all his action
were scanned with a jealous eye.[2] During the Persian wa
also, he rashly attempted to diminish the pay and rations c
the troops, and this ill-timed measure caused a sedition, whic
was suppressed with the greatest difficulty, but which left fee
ings of ill-will in the minds of the emperor and the army, an
laid the foundation of the ruin of both.[3]

Fortune, however, proved eminently favourable to Maurice
in his contest with Persia, and he obtained that peace whic
neither the prudence nor the military exertions of Tiberiu
had succeeded in concluding. A civil war rendered Chosroes
the son of Hormisdas, an exile, and compelled him to solici
the protection of the Romans. Maurice received him wit
humanity, and, acting according to the dictates of a just an
generous policy, aided him to recover his paternal throne
When reinstated on the throne of Persia, Chosroes conclude
a peace with the Roman empire, which promised to prove las
ing; for Maurice wisely sought to secure its stability, by de
manding no concession injurious to the honour or politica
interests of Persia. Dara and Nisibis were restored to th
Romans, and a strong and defensible frontier formed by th
cession, on the part of Chosroes, of a portion of Pers
Armenia.

Roman emperor, and the degraded position of the Greek nation. Natives could not b
trusted, yet good soldiers were required to overawe the foreign mercenaries. The pos
tion of the Roman emperor and of the Roman empire, at this time, was not unlike tha
of the caliphate of Bagdat, three centuries later, and in military matters, somewha
similar to the Othoman empire after the termination of its period of conquest.

[1] Theophylactus Sim. *Hist.* iii. 1. *Menandri Fr.* p. 435, edit. Bonn.

[2] *Arriani Tactica cum Mauricii Artis Militaris*, lib. xii. primus edid. vers. lat
notisque illustr. J. Scheffer. Upsal, 1664, 8vo. I possess a copy of this work, whic
Gibbon says was to him an inaccessible book. It deserves a new edition with notes b
a tactician. The military language of the time was a curious mixture of Roman
Greek, and barbarian terms.

[3] A.D. 588.

Section III

Maurice causes a revolution, by attempting to re-establish the ancient authority of the imperial administration

As soon as Maurice had established tranquillity in the Asiatic provinces, he directed his whole force against the Avars, in order to restrain the ravages which they were annually committing in all the country between the Danube and the coast of the Mediterranean. The Avar kingdom now embraced all that portion of Europe which extends from the Carnian Alps to the Black Sea; and the Huns, Sclavonians, and Bulgarians, who had previously lived under independent governments, were either united with their conquerors, or submitted, if not as subjects, at least as vassals, to own the superiority of the Avar monarch. After the conclusion of peace with Persia, the sovereign of the Avars was the only dangerous enemy to the Roman power then in existence; but the Avars, in spite of their rapid and extensive conquests, were unable to assemble an army capable of encountering the regular forces of the empire in the open field. Maurice, confident in the superiority of Roman discipline, resolved to conduct a campaign against the barbarians in person; and there appeared no doubt of its proving successful. His conduct, on this important occasion, is marked by the most singular vacillation of purpose. He quitted Constantinople apparently with the firmest determination to place himself at the head of the army, yet, when a deputation from the court and senate followed him, and entreated that he would take care of his sacred person, he made this solicitation a pretext for a change of resolution, and returned back to his capital. His courage was very naturally called in question, and both his friends and enemies attributed his alarm to sinister omens. It seems, however, not improbable, that his firmness was really shaken by more alarming proofs of his unpopularity, and by the conviction that he would have to encounter far greater difficulties than he had previously expected, in enforcing his projects of reform among the troops. As very often happens to weak and obstinate men, he became distrustful of the success of his measures when he had committed himself to attempt their execution; and he shrank from the effort to perform the task

in person, though he must have doubted whether an under taking requiring so rare a combination of military skill and political sagacity could ever succeed, unless conducted under the eye of its author, and supported by the personal influence and prompt authority of the emperor. His conduct excited the contempt of the soldiers; and whether he trembled at omens, or shrank from responsibility, he was laughed at in the army for his timidity: so that even had nothing occurred to awaken the suspicion or rouse the hatred of the troops employed against the Avars, their scorn for their sovereign would have brought them to the very verge of rebellion.

Though the Roman army gained several battles, and displayed considerable skill, and much of the ancient military superiority in the campaigns against the Avars, still the inhabitants of Mœsia, Illyria, Dardania, Thrace, Macedonia, and even Greece, were exposed to annual incursions of the hostile hordes, who crossed the Danube to plunder the proprietors and cultivators of the soil, so that, at last, whole provinces were left uncultivated, and remained almost entirely depopulated. The imperial armies were generally ill commanded, for the generals were usually selected, either from among the relations of the emperor, or from among the court aristocracy. The spirit of opposition which had arisen between the camp and the court, made it unsafe to intrust the chief command of large bodies of troops to soldiers of fortune, and the most experienced of the Roman officers, who had been bred to the profession of arms, were only employed in secondary posts.[1]

Priscus, who was one of the ablest and most influential of the Roman generals, carried on the war with some success and invaded the country of the Avars and Sclavonians: but his successes appear to have excited the jealousy of the emperor, who, fearing his army more than the forces of his enemies, removed Priscus from the command, in order to intrust it to his own brother. The first duty of the new general was to remodel the organisation of the army, to prepare for the reception of the emperor's ulterior measures of reform. The commencement of a campaign was most unwisely selected as the time for carrying this plan into execution, and a new sedition among the soldiery was the conse-

[1] The court generals of the time were Maurice himself, his brother Peter, his son-in-law Philippicus, Heraclius, the father of the emperor of that name, Comentiolus, and probably Priscus, who appears to be the same person as Crispus.—See Gibbon, ch. xlvi. note 52. The professional soldiers, who attained high commands, were Droctulf, Sueve, Apsich, a Hun, and Ilifred, whose name proves his Gothic or Germanic origin.

quence. The troops being now engaged in continual disputes with the emperor and the civil administration, selected from among their officers the leaders whom they considered most attached to their own views, and these leaders began to negotiate with the government, and consequently to undermine the existing discipline. The mutinous army was soon defeated by the Avars, and Maurice was constrained to conclude a treaty of peace.[1] The provisions of this treaty were the immediate cause of the ruin of Maurice. The Avars had taken prisoners about twelve thousand of the Roman soldiers, and offered to ransom their captives for twelve thousand pieces of gold. It is even said, that when Maurice refused to pay this sum they reduced their demand, and asked only four pieces of silver for each captive; but the emperor, though he consented to add twenty thousand pieces of gold to the former subsidy, refused to pay anything in order to ransom the Roman prisoners.[2]

By this treaty, the Danube was declared the frontier of the empire, and the Roman officers were allowed to cross the river, in order to punish any ravages which the Sclavonians might commit within the Roman territory—a fact which seems to indicate the declining power of the Avar monarch, and the virtual independence of the Sclavonic tribes, to whom this provision applied. It may be inferred also from these terms, that Maurice could easily have delivered the captive Roman soldiers had he wished to do so; and it is natural to conclude that he left them in captivity to punish them for their mutinous behaviour and neglect of discipline, to which he attributed both their captivity and the misfortunes of the empire.[3] It was commonly reported, however, at the time, that the emperor's avarice induced him to refuse to ransom the soldiers, though it is impossible to suppose that Maurice would have

1 A.D. 600.

2 Twelve of the silver coins called Miliaresia were equal to one gold solidus. See Appendix, No. II., tables.

3 It is not improbable that many of the prisoners were really deserters. Desertion was very prevalent among the native conscripts, and Maurice had found it necessary, some years before, to issue an edict prohibiting soldiers and recruits from receiving shelter in monasteries when they deserted their standards. This edict caused much dissatisfaction among the clergy. Gregory the Great considered it an impious setting up of the service of the creature against that of the Creator. He wrote to Maurice, "I, your unworthy servant, know many converted soldiers who in our days have worked miracles and done many signs and wonders." The Pope, it appears, did not think that the most appropriate miracle for these military saints would have been to drive back the barbarians, and save the provinces from pillage and the provincials from starvation or slavery among the heathen.—See Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, i. 459. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, iii. 97, American edit.

committed an act of inhumanity for the paltry saving which thereby accrued to the imperial treasury. The Avars, with singular, and probably unexpected barbarity, put all their prisoners to death. Maurice certainly never contemplated the possibility of their acting with such cruelty, or he would have felt all the impolicy of his conduct, even if it be supposed that passion had, for a time, extinguished the usual humanity of his disposition.[1] The murder of these soldiers was universally ascribed to the avarice of the emperor; and the aversion which the army had long entertained to his government was changed into a deep-rooted hatred of his person; while the people participated in the feeling from a natural dislike to an economical and unsuccessful reformer.

The peace with the Avars was of short duration. Priscus was again intrusted with the command of the army, and again restored the honour of the Roman arms. He carried hostilities beyond the Danube; and affairs were proceeding prosperously, when Maurice, with that perseverance in an unpopular course which weak princes generally consider a proof of strength of character, renewed his attempts to enforce all his schemes for restoring the severest system of discipline. His brother was despatched to the army as commander-in-chief with orders to place the troops in winter quarters in the enemy's country, and compel them to forage for their subsistence. A sedition was the consequence: and the soldiers, already supplied with leaders, broke out into rebellion, threw off their allegiance, and raised Phocas, one of the officers who had risen to distinction in the previous seditions, to the chief command. Phocas led the army directly to Constantinople, where, having found a powerful party dissatisfied with Maurice, he lost no time in securing the throne. The injudicious system of reform pursued by Maurice had rendered him not only hateful to the army, whose abuses he had resolved to eradicate, but also unpopular among the people, whose burdens he wished to alleviate. Yet the emperor's confidence in the rectitude of his intentions supported his character in the most desperate circumstances; and when abandoned by all his subjects, and convinced by a succession of misfortunes that the termination both of his reign and his life was approaching, he showed no signs of cowardice. As his plans of reform had been directed to the increase of his own power

[1] Theophylactus Sim. *Hist.* vii. 15. Theophanes, *Ch.* 235, compared with the notices in the *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 379; A.D. 602.

as the centre of the whole administration, and as he had shown too clearly to all men that his increased authority, when attained, was to be directed against more than one section of the government agents, he lost all influence from the moment he lost his power; and when he found it necessary to abandon Constantinople, he was deserted by every follower. He was soon captured with his family by the agents of Phocas, who ordered them to be immediately executed.[1] The conduct of Maurice at his death affords proof that his private virtues could not be too highly eulogised. He died with fortitude and resignation, after witnessing the execution of his children; and when an attempt, which has been already alluded to, was made to substitute the infant of a nurse instead of his youngest child, he himself revealed the deceit, in order to prevent the death of an innocent person.

The sedition which put an end to the reign of Maurice, though it originated in the camp, became, as the army advanced towards the capital, a popular as well as a military movement. Many causes had long threatened a conflict between official power and popular feeling, for the people hated the administration, and the discordant elements of society in the East had latterly been gaining strength. The central government had found great difficulty in repressing religious disputes and ecclesiastical party feuds. The factions of the amphitheatre, and the national hatred of various classes in the empire, frequently broke out into acts of violence which caused bloodshed. Monks, charioteers, and usurers, could all raise themselves above the law; and the interests of particular bodies of men proved often more powerful to produce disorder and disorganisation than the provincial and local government to enforce tranquillity. The administrative institutions were everywhere too weak to replace the declining strength of the central authority. A persuasion of the absolute necessity of reinvigorating the Roman government had gone abroad; but the power of a rapacious aristocracy, and the corruption of an idle populace in the capital, fed by the State, presented insuperable obstacles to the tranquil adoption of any reasonable plan of political reformation. The provincials were too poor and ignorant to originate any scheme of amelioration, and it was dangerous even for an emperor to attempt the task, as no national institutions enabled the sovereign to unite any powerful body of his subjects in a systematic opposition to

[1] At the Eutropian port beyond Chalcedon, now Mundi Bournou.

the venality of the aristocracy, the corruption of the capital and the license of the army. Those national feelings which began to acquire force in some provinces, and in a few municipalities where the attacks of Justinian had proved ineffectual, tended more to awaken a desire for independence than to wish to support the emperor, or a hope of improvement in the Roman administration.

The arbitrary and illegal conduct of the imperial officers, while it rendered sedition venial, very often insured its partial success and complete impunity.[1] The measures of reform proposed by Maurice appear to have been directed, like the reforms of most absolute monarchs, rather to increase his own authority than to establish a system of administration so firmly established on a legal basis, as to prove even more powerful than the despotic will of the emperor himself. To confine the absolute power of the emperor to the executive administration, to make the law supreme, and to vest the legislative authority in some responsible body or senate, were not projects suitable to the age of Maurice, and perhaps hardly possible in the state of society. Maurice resolved that his first step in the career of improvement should be to render the army, long a licentious and turbulent check on the imperial power, a well-disciplined and efficient instrument of his will; and he hoped in this manner to repress the tyranny of the official aristocracy, restrain the license of the military chiefs, prevent the sects of Nestorians and Eutychians from forming separate states, and render the authority of the central government supreme in all the distant provinces and isolated cities of the empire. In his struggle to obtain this result he was compelled to make use of the existing administration; and, consequently, he appears in the history of the empire as the supporter and protector of a detested aristocracy, equally unpopular with the army and the people; while his ulterior plans for the improvement of the civil condition of his subjects were never fully made known, and perhaps never clearly framed even by himself, though it is evident that many of them ought to have preceded his military changes. This view of the political position of Maurice, as it could not escape the observation of his contemporaries, is alluded to in the quaint expression of Evagrius, that Maurice expelled from his mind the democracy of the passions, and established the aristocracy of reason, though the ecclesiastical historian, a cautious courtier, either

[1] The sedition of Asimus.—Theophylactus Sim. *Hist.* vii. 3.

could not or would not express himself with a more general application, or in a clearer manner.[1]

Section IV

Phocas was the representative of a revolution, not of a national party

Though Phocas ascended the throne in virtue of his position as leader of the rebellious army, he was universally regarded as the representative of the popular hostility to the existing order of administration, to the ruling aristocracy, and to the government party in the church. A great portion of the Roman world expected improvement as a consequence of any change, but that produced by the election of Phocas to the Roman purple was followed by a series of misfortunes almost unparalleled in the history of revolutions. The ties which connected the social and political institutions of the Eastern Empire were severed, and circumstances which must have appeared to contemporaries only as the prelude of a passing storm tending to purify the moral horizon, soon created a whirlwind which tore up the very roots of the Roman power, and prepared the minds of men to receive new impressions.

The government of Phocas convinced the majority of his subjects that the rebellion of a licentious army, and the sedition of a pampered populace, were not the proper instruments for ameliorating the condition of the empire. In spite of the hopes of his followers, of the eulogium on the column which still exists in the Roman forum, and of the praises of Pope Gregory the Great, it was quickly discovered that Phocas was a worse sovereign than his predecessor. Even as a soldier he was inferior to Maurice, and the glory of the Roman arms was stained by his cowardice or incapacity. Chosroes, the king of Persia, moved, as he asserted, by gratitude, and the respect due to the memory of his benefactor Maurice, declared war against the murderer. A war commenced between the Persian and Roman empires, which proved the last and bloodiest of their numerous struggles; and its violence and strange vicissitudes contributed in a great degree to the

[1] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, xlv. note 31. Evagrius, vi. 1. Proof that the fabric of the imperial administration was felt to be in danger before the accession of Maurice is given by Theophylactus Simocatta, p. 11, edit. Par. An angel appeared to Tiberius II. in a dream, and informed him that days of anarchy should not commence during his reign.

dissolution of both these ancient monarchies. The success of Chosroes compelled Phocas to conclude an immediate peace with the Avars, in order to secure himself from being attacked in Constantinople.[1] The treaty which he concluded is of great importance in the history of the Greek population in Europe, but, unfortunately, we can only trace it in its effects at a later period. The whole of the agricultural districts of the Roman empire in Europe were virtually abandoned to the ravages of the northern nations, and, from the Danube to the Peloponnesus, the Sclavonian tribes ravaged the country with impunity, or settled in the depopulated provinces. Phocas availed himself of the treaty to transport into Asia the whole military force which he could collect, but the Roman armies, having lost their discipline, were everywhere defeated. Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Paphlagonia were laid waste; and nothing appears to have saved the Roman empire from complete conquest by the Persians, but the wars carried on at the time by Chosroes with the Armenians and the Turks, which prevented his concentrating his whole force against Constantinople. The tyranny and incapacity of Phocas rapidly increased the disorders in the civil and military administration; seditions broke out in the army, and rebellions in the provinces. The emperor, either because he partook of the bigotry of his age or because he desired by his measures to secure the support of the clergy and the applause of the populace, determined to prove his orthodoxy by ordering all the Jews in the empire to be baptised. The Jews, who formed a wealthy and powerful class in many of the cities of the East, resisted this act of oppression, and caused a bloody sedition, which contributed much to aid the progress of the Persian arms.

Various districts and provinces in the distant parts of the empire, observing the confusion which reigned in the central administration, and the increasing weakness of the imperial power, availed themselves of the opportunity to extend the authority of their municipal institutions. The dawn of the temporal authority of the Popes, and of the liberty of the Italian cities, may be traced to this period, though they were still hardly perceptible. Pope Gregory the Great only cavilled at the conduct of Maurice, who allowed the Bishop of Constantinople to assume the title of œcumenical patriarch, and he eulogised the virtues of Phocas, who compelled the patriarch

[1] Theophanes, *Chron.* 245, 251.

to lay aside the irritating epithet.[1] Phocas at last exhausted the patience even of the timid aristocracy of Constantinople, and all classes directed their attention to seek a successor to the tyrant. Heraclius, the exarch of Africa, had commanded with success in the former war with Persia, and had long governed Africa, in which his family possessed great influence, almost as an independent sovereign.[2] To him the leading men at Constantinople addressed their complaints, and prayed him to deliver the empire from ruin, and dethrone the reigning tyrant.

The exarch of Africa soon collected a considerable army, and fitted out a numerous fleet. The command of this expedition was given to his son Heraclius; and as the possession of Egypt, which supplied Constantinople with provisions for its idle populace, was necessary to secure tranquillity after conquest, Nicetas, the nephew of the exarch, was sent with an army to support his cousin, and secure both Egypt and Syria. Heraclius proceeded directly to Constantinople, and the fate of Phocas was decided in a single naval engagement, fought within sight of his palace. The disorder which reigned in every branch of the administration, in consequence of the folly and incapacity of the ignorant soldier who ruled the empire, was so great, that no measures had been concerted for offering a vigorous resistance to the African expedition. Phocas was taken prisoner, stripped of the imperial robes, covered with a black cloak, and, with his hands tied behind him, was carried on board the ship of Heraclius. The young conqueror indignantly addressed him: "Wretch! in what manner have you governed the empire?" The dethroned tyrant, roused by the tone which seemed to proclaim that his successor would prove as cruel as he had been himself, and perhaps feeling the difficulties of the task to be insurmountable, answered with a sneer, "You will govern it better!" Heraclius lost his temper at the advantage which his predecessor had gained in this verbal contest; and showed that it was very questionable whether he himself would prove either a wiser sovereign or a better man than Phocas, by ordering the dethroned emperor to be immediately decapitated, and his mutilated members to be exhibited to the populace of Constantinople. All the leading partisans of Phocas were executed,

[1] On the subject of the supposed concession of the title of universal bishop to pope Boniface III., see Hallam, *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, i. 520; and Supp. Notes, 189.

[2] Ducange, *Historia Byzantina*, 117.

as if to afford evidence that the cruelty of that tyrant had been as much a national as a personal vice. Since his death he has been fortunate enough to find defenders, who consider that his alliance with Pope Gregory, and his leaning toward the Latin party in the church, are to be regarded as signs of virtue, and proofs of a capacity for government.[1]

Section V

THE EMPIRE UNDER HERACLIUS

The young Heraclius became Emperor of the East, and his father continued to rule Africa, which the family appear to have regarded as a hereditary domain. For several years the government of the new emperor was quite as unsuccessful as that of his predecessor, though, doubtless, it was more popular and less tyrannical. There are reasons, however, for believing that this period of apparent misgovernment and general misfortune was not one of complete neglect. Though defeats and disgraces followed one another with rapidity, the causes of these disasters had grown up during the preceding reigns; and Heraclius was compelled to labour silently in clearing away many petty abuses, and in forming a new corps of civil and military officers, before he could venture on any important act. His chief attention was of necessity devoted to prepare for the great struggle of restoring the Roman empire to some portion of its ancient strength and power; and he had enough of the Roman spirit to resolve, that, if he could not succeed, he would risk his own life and fortune in the attempt, and perish in the ruins of civilised society. History has preserved few records of the measures adopted by Heraclius during the

[1] Several works have been published concerning the emperor Phocas, but in 1843 I found them wanting in the Bibliothèque du Roi, and in the library of the British Museum: A. de Stoppelaar, *Oratio pro Phoca Imperatore*; and Simon Van der Brinks *Oratio in Phocam Imperatorem*, Amstel. 1732. *Vertheidigung des K. Phocas, in Erlangischen gelehrten Anzeigen auf das Jahr* 1749, pp. 321, 328, 400, 414. This lass work defends him against the accusation of having founded the power of the popes—a virtue, and not a crime, in the eyes of some. D. Cyprian, *Vom Ursprung des Papstthums*, c. xvii. 812.

See *Bibliotheca Historica instructa a Struvio, aucta a Budero, nunc vero a Muselio digesta*. Lipsiæ, Weidmann, 1790, 11 vols.

Both Phocas and Maurice were Cappadocians, and the verses in the Anthology probably were not very advantageous to the tranquillity of these emperors,

Καππαδόκαι φαῦλοι μὲν ἀεί· ζώνης δὲ τυχόντες,
φαυλότεροι· κέρδους δ' εἵνεκα φαυλότατοι. κ. τ. λ.

Antholog. iii. 54, edit. Tauch. Joannes Lydus, *De Magist. R. R.* p. 250, edit. Bonn.

early years of his reign; but their effect in restoring the strength of the empire, and in reviving the energy of the imperial administration, is testified by the great changes which mark the subsequent period.

The reign of Heraclius is one of the most remarkable epochs, both in the history of the empire and in the annals of mankind. It warded off the almost inevitable destruction of the Roman government for another century; it laid the foundation of that policy which prolonged the existence of the imperial power at Constantinople under a new modification, as the Byzantine monarchy; and it was contemporary with the commencement of the great moral change in the condition of the people which transformed the language and manners of the ancient world into those of modern nations. The Eastern Empire was indebted to the talents of Heraclius for its escape from those ages of barbarism which, for many centuries, prevailed in all western Europe. No period of society could offer a field for instructive study more likely to present practical results to the highly-civilised political communities of modern Europe; yet there is no time of which the existing memorials of the constitution and frame of society are so imperfect and unsatisfactory. A few important historical facts and single events can alone be gleaned, from which an outline of the administration of Heraclius may be drawn, and an attempt made to describe the situation of his Greek subjects.

The loss of many extensive provinces, and the destruction of numerous large armies since the death of Justinian, had given rise to a persuasion that the end of the Roman empire was approaching; and the events of the earlier part of the reign of Heraclius were not calculated to remove this impression. Fanaticism and avidity were the prominent social features of the time. The civil government became more oppressive in the capital as the revenues of the provinces conquered by the Persians were lost. The military power of the empire declined to such a degree, from the poverty of the imperial government, and the aversion of the people to military service, that the Roman armies were nowhere able to keep the field. Heraclius found the treasury empty, the civil administration demoralised, the agricultural classes ruined, the army disorganised, the soldiers deserting their standards to become monks, and the richest provinces occupied by his enemies. A review of the position of the empire at his accession attests the extraordinary talents of the man who could emerge from

the accumulated disadvantages of this situation, and achieve a career of glory and conquest almost unrivalled. It proves also the wonderful perfection of the system of administration which admitted of reconstructing the fabric of the civil government when the very organisation of civil society had been completely shattered. The ancient supremacy of the Roman empire could not be restored by human genius; the progress of mankind down the stream of time had rendered a return to the past condition of the world impracticable; but yet the speed of the vessel of the State in descending the torrent was moderated, and it was saved from being dashed to pieces on the rocks. Heraclius delivered the empire and the imperial city of Constantinople from almost certain destruction by the Persians and the Avars; and though his fortune sank before the first fury of Mahomet's enthusiastic votaries, his sagacious administration had prepared those powerful means of resistance which enabled the Greeks to check the Saracen armies almost at the threshold of their dominions; and the caliphs, while extending their successful conquests to the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic, were for centuries compelled to wage a doubtful war on the northern frontiers of Syria.

It was perhaps a misfortune for mankind that Heraclius was by birth a Roman rather than a Greek, as his views were from that accident directed to the maintenance of the imperial dominion, without any reference to the national organisation of his people. His civilisation, like that of a large portion of the ruling class in the Eastern Empire, was too far removed from the state of ignorance into which the mass of the population had fallen, for the one to be influenced by the feelings of the other, or for both to act together with the energy conferred by unity of purpose in a variety of ranks. Heraclius, being by birth and family connections an African noble, must have regarded himself as of pure Roman blood, superior to all national prejudices, and bound by duty and policy to repress the domineering spirit of the Greek aristocracy in the State, and of the Greek hierarchy in the Church.[1] Language and manners began to give to national feelings almost as much power in forming men into distinct societies as political arrangements. The influence of the clergy followed these divisions established by language, rather than the political organisation adopted by the government: and as the clergy now formed the most popular and the ablest portion of society,

[1] Ducange, *Historia Byzantina*, 117.

the church exerted more influence over the minds of the people than the civil administration and the imperial power, even though the emperor was the acknowledged sovereign and master of the patriarchs and the pope. It is necessary to observe here, that the established church of the empire had ceased to be the universal Christian church. The Greeks had rendered themselves the depositaries of its power and influence; they had already corrupted Christianity into the Greek church; and other nations were rapidly forming separate ecclesiastical societies to supply their own spiritual wants. The Armenians, Syrians, and Egyptians, were induced by national aversion to the ecclesiastical tyranny of the Greeks, as well as by spiritual preference of the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, to oppose the established church. At the time Heraclius ascended the throne, these national and religious feelings already exercised their power of modifying the operations of the Roman government, and of enabling mankind to advance one step towards the establishment of individual liberty and intellectual independence. Circumstances, which will be subsequently noticed, prevented society from making any progress in this career of improvement, and effectually arrested its advance for many centuries. In western Europe, this struggle never entirely lost its important characteristic of a moral contest for the enjoyment of personal rights, and the exercise of individual opinion; and as no central government succeeded in maintaining itself permanently independent of all national feelings, a check on the formation of absolute authority always existed, both in the Church and State. Heraclius, in his desire to restore the power of the empire, strove to destroy these sentiments of religious liberty. He persecuted all who opposed his political power in ecclesiastical matters; he drove the Nestorians from the great church of Edessa, and gave it to the orthodox. He banished the Jews from Jerusalem, and forbade them to approach within three thousand paces of the Holy City. His plans of coercion or conciliation would evidently have failed as completely with the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Jacobites, as they did with the Jews; but the contest with Mohammedanism closed the struggle, and concentrated the whole strength of the unconquered population of the empire in support of the Greek church, and Constantinopolitan government.

In order fully to comprehend the lamentable state of weakness to which the empire was reduced, it will be necessary to

take a cursory view of the condition of the different provinces. The continual ravages of the barbarians who occupied the country beyond the Danube had extended as far as the southern shores of the Peloponnesus. The agricultural population was almost exterminated, except where it was protected by the immediate vicinity of fortified towns, or secured by the fastnesses of the mountains. The inhabitants of all the countries between the Archipelago and the Adriatic had been greatly diminished, and fertile provinces remained everywhere desolate, ready to receive new occupants. As great part of these countries yielded very little revenue to the government they were considered by the court of Constantinople as of hardly any value, except in so far as they covered the capital from hostile attacks, or commanded the commercial routes to the west of Europe. At this time the Indian and Chinese trade had in part been forced round the north of the Caspian Sea in consequence of the Persian conquests in Syria and Egypt, and the disturbed state of the country immediately to the east of Persia. The rich produce transported by the caravans which reached the northern shores of the Black Sea, was then transported to Constantinople, and from thence distributed through western Europe. Under these circumstances Thessalonica and Dyrrachium became points of great consequence to the empire, and were successfully defended by the emperor amidst all his calamities. These two cities commanded the extremities of the usual road between Constantinople and Ravenna, and connected the towns on the Archipelago with the Adriatic and with Rome.[1] The open country was abandoned to the Avars and Sclavonians, who were allowed to effect permanent settlements even to the south of the Via Egnatia; but none of these settlements were suffered to interfere with the lines of communication, without which the imperial influence in Italy would have been soon annihilated, and the trade of the West lost to the Greeks. The ambition of the barbarians was inclined to dare any attempt to encroach on the wealth of the Eastern Empire, and they tried to establish a system of maritime depredations in the Archipelago: but Heraclius was able to frustrate their schemes, though it is probable that he owed his success more to the exertions of the mercantile population of the Greek cities, than to the exploits of his own troops.[2]

[1] Tafel, *De Thessalonica*, proleg. cviii. p. 221. Hüllman, *Geschichte des Byzantin. Handels*, 76.

[2] Paul. Diaconus, iv. 21.

When disorder reigned in the territory nearest to the seat of government, it cannot be supposed that the administration of the distant provinces was conducted with greater prudence or success. The Gothic kingdom of Spain was, at this time, ruled by Sisebut,[1] an able and enlightened monarch, whose policy was directed to gain over the Roman provincials by peaceful measures, and whose arms were employed to conquer the remaining territories of the empire in the Peninsula. He soon reduced the imperial possessions to a small extent of coast on the ocean, embracing the modern province of Algarve, and a few towns on the shores of the Mediterranean. He likewise interrupted the communications between the Roman troops and Spain and Africa, by building a fleet, and conquering Tangiers and the neighbouring country. Heraclius concluded a treaty with Sisebut, in the year 614, and the Romans were thus enabled to retain their Spanish territories until the reign of Suintilla, who, while Heraclius was engaged in his Persian campaigns, finally expelled the Romans (or the Greeks, as they were generally termed in the West) from the Spanish continent.[2] Seventy-nine years had elapsed since the Roman authority had been re-established in the south of Spain by the conquests of Justinian. Even under the disadvantages to which the imperial power was exposed, the commercial superiority of the Greeks still enabled them to retain possession of the Balearic Islands until a later period.[3]

National distinctions and religious interests tended to divide the population, and to balance political power, much more in Italy than in the other countries of Europe. The influence of the church in protecting the people, the weakness of the Lombard sovereigns, from the small numerical strength of the Lombard population, and the oppressive fiscal government of the Roman exarchs, gave the Italians the means of creating a national existence, amidst the conflicts of their masters. Yet so imperfect was the unity of interests, or so great were the difficulties of communication between the people of various parts of Italy, that the imperial authority not only defended its own dominions with success against foreign enemies, but also repressed with ease the ambitious or

[1] A.D. 610–619. [2] A.D. 623.

[3] Roman and Greek interests, and party feelings, continued to maintain some influence in the Peninsula for many years. In 673, the Duke Flavius Paulus, a provincial in the service of the Goths, almost succeeded in seizing the crown of Spain.—*History of Spain and Portugal*, i. 137. *Cabinet Cyclop.* Aschbach's *Geschichte der Westgothen*, 279.

patriotic attempts of the popes to acquire political power, an punished equally the seditions of the people and the rebellion of the chiefs, who, like John Compsa of Naples, and th exarch Eleutherinus, aspired at independence.

Africa alone, of all the provinces of the empire, continue to use the Latin language in ordinary life; and its inhabitan regarded themselves, with some reason, as the purest descen dants of the Romans. After the victories of John th Patrician, it had enjoyed a long period of tranquillity, and i prosperity was undisturbed by any spirit of nationality adverse to the supremacy of the empire, or by schismatic opinion hostile to the church. The barbarous tribes to the sout were feeble enemies, and no foreign State possessed a nav force capable of troubling its repose or interrupting i commerce. Under the able and fortunate administration Heraclius and Gregoras, the father and uncle of the empero Africa formed the most flourishing portion of the empir Its prosperous condition, and the wars raging in othe countries, threw great part of the commerce of the Medite ranean into the hands of the Africans. Wealth and populatio increased to such a degree, that the naval expedition of th emperor Heraclius, and the army of his cousin Nicetas, wer fitted out from the resources of Africa alone. Another stron proof of the prosperity of the province, of its importance t the empire, and of its attachment to the interests of th Heraclian family, is afforded by the resolution which th emperor adopted, in the ninth year of his reign, of transferrin the imperial residence from Constantinople to Carthage.

The immense population of Constantinople gave gre inquietude to the government. Constantine the Great, i order to favour the increase of his new capital, had grante daily allowances of bread to the possessors of house Succeeding emperors, for the purpose of caressing the popu lace, had largely increased the numbers of those entitled t this gratuity. In 618, the Persians overran Egypt, and b their conquest stopped the annual supplies of grain destine for the public distributions in the capital. Heraclius, ruine in his finances, but fearing to announce the discontinuance o these allowances, so necessary to keep the population of Con stantinople in good humour, engaged to continue the suppl on receiving a payment of three pieces of gold from eac claimant. His necessities, however, very soon became s great, that he ceased to continue the distributions, and thu

defrauded those citizens of their money whom the fortune of war had deprived of their bread.[1] The danger of his position must have been greatly increased by this bankruptcy, and the dishonour must have rendered his residence among the people whom he had deceived galling to his mind. Shame, therefore, may possibly have suggested to Heraclius the idea of quitting Constantinople; but his selection of Carthage, as the city to which he wished to transfer the seat of government, must have been determined by the wealth, population, and security of the African province. Carthage offered military resources for recovering possession of Egypt and Syria, of which we can only now estimate the extent by taking into consideration the expedition that placed Heraclius himself on the throne. Many reasons connected with the constitution of the civil government of the empire, might likewise be adduced as tending to influence the preference.

In Constantinople, an immense body of idle inhabitants had been collected, a mass that had long formed a burden on the State, and acquired a right to a portion of its resources. A numerous nobility, and a permanent imperial household, conceived that they formed a portion of the Roman government, from the prominent part which they acted in the ceremonial that connected the emperor with the people. Thus, the great natural advantages of the geographical position of the capital were neutralised by moral and political causes; while the desolate state of the European provinces, and the vicinity of the northern frontier, began to expose it to frequent sieges. As a fortress and place of arms, it might have still formed the bulwark of the empire in Europe; but while it remained the capital, its immense unproductive population required that too large a part of the resources of the State should be devoted to supplying it with provisions, to guarding against the factions and the seditions of its populace, and to maintaining in it a powerful garrison. The luxury of the Roman court had, during ages of unbounded wealth and unlimited power, assembled round the emperor an infinity of courtly offices, and caused an enormous expenditure, which it was extremely dangerous to suppress and impossible to continue.

[1] *Chronicon Paschale*, 389. The abolition of these public distributions of provisions appears to have infused new life into the administration. The ebb in the fortunes of the empire changed when liberty of commerce and the abolition of ancient privileges gave labour additional value. The condition of nations is oftener changed by an addition to the wages of labour than by the political theories of philosophers, yet history often records the idle speculation and overlooks the practical improvement.

No national feelings or particular line of policy connected Heraclius with Constantinople, and his frequent absence during the active years of his life indicates that, as long as his personal energy and health allowed him to direct the public administration, he considered the constant residence of the emperor in that city injurious to the general interests of the State. On the other hand Carthage was, at this time, peculiarly a Roman city; and in actual wealth, in the numbers of its independent citizens, and in the activity of its whole population, was probably inferior to no city in the empire. It is not surprising, therefore, that Heraclius, when compelled to suppress the public distributions of bread in the capital, to retrench the expenditure of his court and make many reforms in his civil government, should have wished to place the imperial treasury and his own resources in a place of greater security, before he engaged in his desperate struggle with Persia. The wish, therefore, to make Carthage the capital of the Roman empire may, with far greater probability, be connected with the gallant project of his Eastern campaigns, than with the cowardly or selfish motives attributed to him by the Byzantine writers.

When the project of Heraclius to remove to Carthage was generally known, the Greek patriarch, the Greco-Roman aristocracy, and the Byzantine people, became alarmed at the loss of power, wealth, public shows, and largesses consequent on the departure of the court, and were eager to change his resolution. As far as Heraclius was personally concerned, the anxiety displayed by every class to retain him, may have relieved his mind from the shame caused by his financial fraud; and as want of personal courage was certainly not one of his defects, he may have abandoned a wise resolution without much regret, if he had thought the enthusiasm which he witnessed likely to aid his military plans. The Patriarch and the people, hearing that he had shipped his treasures, and was prepared to follow with all the imperial family, assembled tumultuously, and induced the emperor to swear in the church of St. Sophia, that he would defend the empire to his death and regard the people of Constantinople as peculiarly the children of his throne.

Egypt, from its wonderful natural resources, and its numerous and industrious population, had long been the most valuable province of the empire. It poured a very great portion of its gross produce into the imperial treasury; for its

agricultural population, being destitute of all political power and influence, were compelled to pay, not only taxes, but a tribute, which was viewed as a rent for the soil, to the Roman government. At this time, however, the wealth of Egypt was on the decline. The circumstances which had driven the trade of India to the north, had caused a great decrease in the demand for the grain of Egypt on the shores of the Red Sea, and for its manufactures in Arabia and Ethiopia. The canal between the Nile and the Red Sea, whose existence is intimately connected with the prosperity of these countries, had been neglected during the government of Phocas. A large portion of the Greek population of Alexandria had been ruined, because an end had been put to the public distributions of grain, and poverty had invaded the fertile land of Egypt. John the Almsgiver, who was patriarch and imperial prefect in the reign of Heraclius, did everything in his power to alleviate this misery. He established hospitals, and devoted the revenues of his See to charity; but he was an enemy to heresy, and consequently he was hardly looked on as a friend by the native population. National feelings, religious opinions, and local interests, had always nourished, in the minds of the native Egyptians, a deep-rooted hatred of the Roman administration and of the Greek church; and this feeling of hostility only became more concentrated after the union of the offices of prefect and patriarch by Justinian. A complete line of separation existed between the Greek colony of Alexandria and the native population, who during the decline of the Greeks and Jews of Alexandria intruded themselves into political business, and gained some degree of official importance. The cause of the emperor was now connected with the commercial interests of the Greek and Melchite parties, but these ruling classes were regarded by the agricultural population of the rest of the province as interlopers on their sacred Jacobite soil.[1] John the Almsgiver, though a Greek patriarch, and an imperial prefect, was not perfectly free from the charge of heresy, nor, perhaps, of employing the revenues under his control with more attention

[1] The Melchites were those Christians in Syria and Egypt who, though not Greeks, followed the doctrines of the Greek church. They were called Melchites (royalists, from Melcha, Syriac, a king) by their adversaries, on account of their implicit obedience to the edict of Marcian in favour of the Council of Chalcedon. Jacob Baradæus, or Zanzalus, bishop of Edessa, the great heterodox apostle of the East, blended the various sects of Eutychians and Monophysites into a powerful church, whose followers were generally called, after his death, Jacobites. He died A.D. 578. Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, Soames' edit. ii. 56.

to charity than to public utility. The exigencies of Heracli
were so great that he sent his cousin, the patrician Nicetas,
Egypt, in order to seize the immense wealth which the pat
arch John was said to possess. In the following year t
Persians invaded the province; and the patrician and pat
arch, unable to defend even the city of Alexandria, fled
Cyprus, while the enemy was allowed to subdue the valley
the Nile to the borders of Libya and Ethiopia, without mee
ing any opposition from the imperial forces, and apparent
with the good wishes of the Egyptians. The plunder obtain
from public property and slaves was immense; and as th
power of the Greeks was annihilated, the native Egyptia
availed themselves of the opportunity to acquire a domina
influence in the administration of their country.

For ten years the province owned allegiance to Persi
though it enjoyed a certain degree of doubtful independen
under the immediate government of a native intendant-gener
of the land revenues, named Mokaukas, who subsequentl
at the time of the Saracen conquest, acted a conspicuous pa
in the history of his country. During the Persian supremac
he became so influential in the administration, that he
styled by several writers the Prince of Egypt.[1] Mokauka
under the Roman government, had conformed to the esta
lished church, in order to hold an official situation, but H
was, like most of his countrymen, at heart a Monophysit
and consequently inclined to oppose the imperial administr
tion, both from religious and political motives. Yet, it appea
that a portion of the Monophysite clergy steadily refused t
submit to the Persian government; and Benjamin, their patr
arch, retired from his residence at Alexandria when that cit
fell into the hands of the Persians, and did not return unt
Heraclius had recovered possession of Egypt.[2] Mokauka
established himself in the city of Babylon, or Misr, which ha
grown up, on the decline of Memphis, to be the native capita

[1] P. Rahebi, *Chronicon Orientale*, à J. S. Assemano, 85; edit. Venet. The missi
of the Patrician Nicetas to seize the wealth of John the Charitable must have take
place before the year 616, as in that year he died on his way to Constantinop
Lebeau and Gibbon, on the authority of Baronius in his *Annales Ecclesiastici*, pla
this event in the year 620; but Petau, in his Notes to Nicephorus the Patriarch, h
observed the anachronism of five years. *Nicephori Pat. Hist. Notæ*, 64. See al
Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xi. 52. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, c. xlvii. no
147. Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* iv. 1. *Chronicon Orientale*, 120, edit. Venet.

[2] *Chronicon Orientale*, 127. "Abfuit autem sede sua profugus per annos
decem scilicet sub imperio Heraclii quibus Persæ, Egyptum et Alexandriam possederan
et tres sub imperio Mohametanorum," &c. Yet Benjamin is said to have been banishe
by Heraclius for ten years.—Renaudot, *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum
Jacobitorum*.

f the province, and the chief city in the interior.[1] The ıoment appears to have been extremely favourable for the stablishment of an independent state by the Monophysite gyptians, since, amidst the conflicts of the Persian and oman empires, the immense revenues and supplies of grain ormerly paid to the emperor might have been devoted to ıe defence of the country. But the native population ppears, from the conduct of the patriarch Benjamin, not to ave been united in its views; and probably the agricultural lasses, though numerous, living in abundance, and firm in ıeir Monophysite tenets, had not the knowledge necessary o aspire at national independence, the strength of character equired to achieve it, or the command of the precious metals ecessary to purchase the service of mercenary troops and rovide the materials of war. They had been so long deprived f arms and of all political rights, that they had probably dopted the opinion prevalent among the subjects of all espotic governments, that public functionaries are invariably naves, and that the oppression of the native is more grievous ıan the yoke of a stranger. The moral defects of the people ould certainly, at this favourable conjuncture, alone have revented the establishment of an independent Egyptian and acobite state.

In Syria and Palestine, the different races who peopled the ountry were then, as in our own day, extremely divided; and ıeir separation, by language, manners, interests, and religion, endered it impossible for them to unite for the purpose of aining any object opposed by the imperial government. The 'ersians had penetrated into Palestine, plundered Jerusalem, urned the church of the holy sepulchre, and carried off the oly cross with the patriarch Zachurias into Persia in the year 14.[2] The native Syrians, though they retained their language nd literature, and showed the strength of their national char- cter by their opposition to the Greek church, seemed not o have constituted the majority of the inhabitants of the rovince. They were farther divided by their religious pinions; for, though generally Monophysites, a part was ttached to the Nestorian church. The Greeks appear to ave formed the most numerous class of the population, ıough they were almost entirely confined within the walls

1 Strabo (lib. xvii. c. 1. tom. iii. p. 447, edit. Tauch.) mentions Babylon as a fortified own, and one of the stations of the Roman garrison in Egypt. It occupied the site f Old Cairo, and is famous in the history and poetry of the middle ages.—Lebeau, xi. 7, notes de S. M.

2 *Chronicon Pasch.* 385.

of the cities. Many of them were, doubtless, the dir descendants of the colonies which had prospered and creased under the domination of the Seleucidæ. The p tection and patronage of the civil and ecclesiastical adminis tion of the Eastern Empire had preserved these Greek colon separate from the natives, and supported them by a contin influx of Greeks engaged in the service of the Church a State. But though the Greeks probably formed the m numerous body of the population, yet the circumstances their composing the ruling class in the land, united all t other classes in opposition to their authority. Being, co sequently, deprived of the support of the agricultural popu tion, and unable to recruit their numbers by an influx fr their rural neighbours, they became more and more aliens the country, and were alone incapable of offering a long a steady resistance to any foreign enemy, without the consta support of the imperial treasury and armies.

The Jews, whose religion and nationality have always su ported one another, had, for more than a century, be increasing very remarkably, both in numbers and wealth, every part of the civilised world. The wars and rivalry the various nations of conquerors, and of conquered peop in the south of Europe, had opened to the Jews a freedo of commercial intercourse with all parties, which each natio moved by national jealousy, refused to its own neighbou and only conceded to a foreign people, of whom no politic jealousy could be entertained. This circumstance explai the extraordinary increase in the number of the Jews, whi becomes apparent, in the seventh century, in Greece, Afric Spain, and Arabia, by referring it to the ordinary laws of t multiplication of the human species, when facilities are fou for acquiring augmented supplies of the means of subsistenc without inducing us to suppose that the Jews succeede during this period, in making more proselytes than they ha done at other times. This increase of their numbers an wealth soon roused the bigotry and jealousy of the Christians while the deplorable condition of the Roman empire, an of the Christian population in the East, inspired the Jew with some expectations of soon re-establishing their nation independence under the expected Messiah. It must be con fessed that the desire of availing themselves of the misfortune of the Roman empire, and of the dissensions of the Christia church, was the natural consequence of the oppression t

hich they had long been subjected, but it not unnaturally ended to increase the hatred with which they were viewed, nd added to their persecutions.

It is said that about this time a prophecy was current, which eclared that the Roman empire would be overthrown by a cir- mcised people. This report may have been spread by the ews, in order to excite their own ardour, and assist their projects rebellion; but the prophecy was saved from oblivion by the bsequent conquests of the Saracens, which could never have een foreseen by its authors. The conduct of the Jews excited ie bigotry, as it may have awakened the fears, of the imperial overnment, and both Phocas and Heraclius attempted to ex- rminate the Jewish religion, and if possible to put an end to e national existence.[1] Heraclius not only practised every ecies of cruelty himself to effect this object within the bounds his own dominions, but he even made the forced conver- on or banishment of the Jews a prominent feature in his plomacy. He consoled himself for the loss of most of the oman possessions in Spain, by inducing Sisebut to insert an ticle in the treaty of peace concluded in 614, engaging the othic monarch to force baptism on the Jews; and he con- dered, that even though he failed in persuading the Franks co-operate with him against the Avars, in the year 620, he d rendered the empire and Christianity some service by in- cing Dagobert to join in the project of exterminating the fortunate Jews.[2] The other portions of the Syrian popula- on aspired at independence, though they did not openly nture to assert it; and during the Persian conquest, the ast of Phœnicia successfully defended itself under the com- and of its native chiefs.[3] At a later period, when the ohammedans invaded the province, many chiefs existed who d attained a considerable degree of local power, and exer- ed an almost independent authority in their districts.[4]

[1] Eutychii *Annales Ecclesiast. Alexand.* ii. 216, 236. The number of the Jews at e was 40,000. Their riches appear to have caused their oppression, and the tyranny their rulers drove them to rebellion. The policy of Heraclius contrasts very un- urably with that of the Gothic king, Theodoric the Great, who, about a century ore, addressed the Jews of Genoa in these words, "We cannot command religion, no one can be compelled to believe if he be unwilling."—Cassiodorus, *Var.* lib. xii. ep. 27.

[2] There were still Christians who disapproved of the forced conversion of the Jews. nt Isidore says, "Sisebutus Judæos ad fidem Christianam permovens æmulationem dem Dei habuit, sed non scientiam."—Isidor. Hisp. *Ch. Goth.* See Aschbach's *chichte der Westgothen*, 240.

[3] Assemani *Bib. Orient.* iii. 421; and his *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis*, vol. vi. o, p. 393.

[4] Ockley's *History of the Saracens*, i. 233; for Edessa, Theophanes, *Ch.* 283, and u'lfaradj, *Ch. Syr.* 119.

As the Roman administration grew weaker in Syria, and t
Persian invasions became more frequent, the Arabs gradua
acquired many permanent settlements amidst the rest of t
inhabitants; and from the commencement of the sever
century, they must be reckoned as an important class of t
population. Their power within the Roman provinces w
increased by the existence of the two independent Arab ki
doms of Ghassan and Hira, which had been formed in p
from territories gained from the Roman and Persian empir
Of these kingdoms, Ghassan was the constant ally or vassal
the Romans; and Hira was equally attached to, or depend
on Persia. Both were Christian states, though the convers
of Hira took place not very long before the reign of Heracli
and the greater part of the inhabitants were Jacobites, mix
with some Nestorians.[1] It may be remarked that the Ara
had been gradually advancing in moral and political civil
tion during the sixth century, and that their religious id
had undergone a very great change. The decline of th
powerful neighbours had allowed them to increase the imp
tance of the commerce which they retained in their own han
and its extension gave them more enlarged views of their o
importance, and suggested ideas of national unity which th
had not previously entertained. These causes had produc
powerful effects on the whole of the Arab population dur
the century which preceded the accession of Heraclius; and
must not be overlooked that Mahomet himself was be
during the reign of Justin II., and that he was educa
under the influence of this national excitement.

The country between Syria and Armenia, or that part
ancient Chaldea which was subject to the Romans, had be
so repeatedly laid waste during the Persian wars, that
agricultural population was nearly exterminated, or had reti
into the Persian provinces. The inhabitants of no portion
the empire were so eager to throw off their allegiance as
Chaldaic Christians, called by the Greeks Nestorians, w
formed the majority of the population of this country.[2] Th
had clung firmly to the doctrine of the two natures of Chr

[1] Sale's *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*, 30.

[2] The Chaldaic Christians considered, and still consider, theirs the real apos
church, though, like all other Christian churches, it partook largely of a nati
character. They used the Syriac language in public worship. Their patriarch res
at Seleucia, in Persia. He now resides at a monastery near Mossul. They had n
bishops in Syria and Armenia, as well as in Mesopotamia. They were charged
confounding the divine and human natures of Christ, and they wished the Virgin M
to be called the mother of Christ, not, as was then usual, the mother of God. T
worshipped no images, and they venerated Nestorius.

fter its condemnation by the council of Ephesus (A.D. 449), nd when they found themselves unable to contend against he temporal power and spiritual influence of the Greeks, they ıad established an independent church, which directed its ttention, with great zeal, to the spiritual guidance of those Christians who dwelt beyond the limits of the Roman empire. The history of their missions, by which churches were estabished in India and China, is an extremely interesting portion of the annals of Christianity.[1] Their zealous exertions, and heir connection with the Christian inhabitants of Persia, nduced the Roman emperors to persecute them with great ruelty, from political as well as religious motives; and this ersecution often insured them the favour of the Persian monarchs. Though they did not always escape the bigotry nd jealousy of the Persians, still they usually enjoyed equitble protection, and became active enemies both of the Greek hurch and the Roman empire, though the geographical posiion and physical configuration of their country afforded them ittle hope of being able to gain political independence.[2]

Armenia was favourably situated for maintaining its indeendence, as soon as the Persian and Roman empires began o decline. Though the country was divided by these rival overnments, the people had preserved their national character, anners, language, and literature, in as great a degree of urity as the Greeks themselves; and as their higher classes ad retained more of wealth, military enterprise, and political ndependence, than the nobility of the other nations of the ast, their services were very highly estimated by their neighours. Their reputation for fidelity and military skill induced he Roman emperors, from the time of Justinian, to raise them o the highest offices in the empire. The Armenians were nable to defend their political independence against its two owerful enemies; but even after the Romans and Persians ad divided their kingdom, they maintained their national xistence unaltered; and, amidst all the convulsions which ave swept over the face of Asia, they have continued to exist s a distinct people, and succeeded in preserving their lanuage and literature. Their national spirit placed them in pposition to the Greek church, and they adopted the opinions f the Monophysites, though under modifications which gave

1 Blumhardh, *Versuch einerallgem einen Missions geschichte der Kirche*, vol. iii.
2 The Jacobites appear not to have been so cruelly persecuted as the Nestorians, for ey were very numerous in Mesopotamia. When the Persians took Edessa they gave o all the churches to the Jacobites.—Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.* 14.

to their church a national character, and separated it from th of the Jacobites. Their history is worthy of a more attenti examination than it has yet met with in English literatu Armenia was the first country in which Christianity beca the established religion of the land; and the people, unc the greatest difficulties, long maintained their independen with the most determined courage; and after the loss of th political power, they have defended their manners, langua religion, and national character with success, against Persia Greeks, Saracens, and Turks.[1]

Asia Minor had become the chief seat of the Roman pow in the time of Heraclius, and the only portion in which t majority of the population was attached to the imper government and to the Greek church. Before the reign Phocas, it had escaped any extensive devastation, so that still retained much of its ancient wealth and splendour; an the social life of the people was still modelled on the instit tions and usages of preceding ages. A considerable interr trade was carried on; and the great roads being kept in tolerable state of repair, served as arteries for the circulatio of commerce and civilisation. That it had, nevertheles suffered very severely in the general decline caused by ove taxation, and by reduced commerce, neglected agricultur and diminished population, is attested by the magnifice ruins of cities which had already fallen to decay, and whic never again recovered their ancient prosperity.

The power of the central administration over its immedia officers was almost as completely destroyed in Asia Minor in the more distant provinces of the empire. A remarkab proof of this general disorganisation of the government is four in the history of the early years of the reign of Heraclius: an one deserving particular attention from its illustrating both h personal character and the state of the empire. Crispus, th son-in-law of Phocas, had materially assisted Heraclius i obtaining the throne; and as a recompense, he was charge with the administration of Cappadocia, one of the riche provinces of the empire, along with the chief command of th troops in his government.[2] Crispus, a man of influence, an

[1] *History of Armenia*, by Father Michael Chamich, translated from the Armeni by J. Avdall: Calcutta, 1827, 2 vols. 8vo. M. de Saint Martin. *Mémoires Histo et Géographiques sur l'Arménie*, 2 vols. Paris, 1818; and numerous additions to edition of Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Paris, 1824. &c., 21 tomes, by the sa author. Neumann, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Armenischen Literatur nach d werken der Mechitaristen.*

[2] Justinian attests the wealth and importance of Cappadocia.—*Novell.* xxx.

of a daring, heedless character, soon ventured to act, not only with independence, but even with insolence, towards the emperor.[1] He neglected the defence of his province; and when Heraclius visited Cesarea to examine into its state and prepare the means of carrying on the war against Persia in person, he displayed a spirit of insubordination and an assumption of importance which amounted to treason. Heraclius, who possessed the means of restraining his fiery temperament, visited the too powerful officer in his bed, which he kept under a slight or affected illness, and persuaded him to visit Constantinople. On his appearance in the senate, he was arrested, and compelled to become a monk. His authority and position rendered it absolutely necessary for Heraclius to punish his presumption, before he could advance with safety against the Persians. Many less important personages, in various parts of the empire, acted with equal independence, without the emperor's considering that it was either necessary to observe, or prudent to punish, their ambition. The decline of the power of the central government, the increasing ignorance of the people, the augmented difficulties in the way of communication, and the general insecurity of property and life, effected extensive changes in the state of society, and threw political influence into the hands of the local governors, the municipal and provincial chiefs, and the whole body of the clergy.

Section VI

Change in the position of the Greek population, which was produced by the Sclavonic establishments in Dalmatia

Heraclius appears to have formed the plan of establishing a permanent barrier in Europe against the encroachments of the Avars and Sclavonians. For the furtherance of this project, it was evident that he could derive no assistance from the inhabitants of the provinces to the south of the Danube. The imperial armies, too, which, in the time of Maurice, had waged an active war in Illyria and Thrace, and frequently invaded the territories of the Avars, had melted away during

[1] His character warrants Gibbon's conjecture that he may have been the Priscus who figured in the reign of Maurice.—*Decline and Fall*, xlvi, note 52. Nicephorus Pat. 6), and Cedrenus (i. 406, edit. Par.) call the son-in-law of Phocas, Crispus. Theophanes 246, 248) and Zonaras (ii. 31) call him Priscus; but Zonaras (p. 82, 83) distinguishes he governor of Cappadocia, whom he calls Crispus.

the disorders of the reign of Phocas. The loss was irreparab
for, in Europe, no agricultural population remained to supp
the recruits required to form a new army.[1] The only feasib
plan for circumscribing the ravages of the northern enemies
the empire which presented itself, was the establishment
powerful colonies of tribes hostile to the Avars and th
eastern Sclavonian allies, in the deserted provinces of Dalma
and Illyria. To accomplish this object, Heraclius induc
the Serbs, or western Sclavonians, who occupied the coun
about the Carpathian Mountains, and who had successfu
opposed the extension of the Avar empire in that directio
to abandon their ancient seats, and move down to the sou
into the provinces between the Adriatic and the Danub
The Roman and Greek population of these provinces h
been driven towards the sea coast by the continual incursio
of the northern tribes, and the desolate plains of the interi
had been occupied by a few Sclavonian subjects and vassals
the Avars. The most important of the western Sclavoni
tribes who moved southward at the invitation of Heracli
were the Servians and Croatians, who settled in the countri
still peopled by their descendants. Their original settlemer
were formed in consequence of friendly arrangements, an
doubtless, under the sanction of an express treaty; for th
Sclavonian people of Illyria and Dalmatia long regarde
themselves as bound to pay a certain degree of territori
allegiance to the Eastern Empire.[2]

The measures of Heraclius were carried into execution wi
skill and vigour. From the borders of Istria to the territo
of Dyrrachium, the whole country was occupied by a varie
of tribes of Servian or western Sclavonic origin, hostile to th
Avars. These colonies, unlike the earlier invaders of th
empire, were composed of agricultural communities; and
the facility which this circumstance afforded them of adoptin
into their political system any remnant of the old Sclavon
population of their conquests, it seems just to attribute th
permanency and prosperity of their settlements. Unlike th
military races of Goths, Huns, and Avars, who had precede
them, the Servian nations increased and flourished in the land
which they had colonised; and by the absorption of eve
relic of the ancient population, they formed political cor

[1] The Dalmatian cities sent every year 1000 cavalry to assist in guarding the passa
of the Danube.—Constantinus Porphyr. *De Admin. Imp.* c. 30, p. 141, edit. Bonn.
[2] Const. Porphyr. *De Administrando Imperio*, c. 31–36.

nunities and independent states, which offered a firm barrier o the Avars and other hostile nations.

It may here be observed, that if the original population of he countries colonised by the Servian nations had at an earlier eriod been relieved from the weight of the imperial taxes, which encroached on their capital, and from the jealous ppression of the Roman government, which prevented their earing arms; in short, if they had been allowed to enjoy all he advantages which Heraclius was compelled to concede to he Servians, we may reasonably suppose that they could have uccessfully defended their country. But after the most estructive ravages of the Goths, Huns, and Avars, the imperial ax-gatherers had never failed to enforce payment of the tribute s long as anything remained undestroyed, though, according o the rules of justice, the Roman government had really orfeited its right to levy the taxes, as soon as it failed to erform its duty in defending the population.

The modern history of the eastern shores of the Adriatic ommences with the establishment of the Sclavonian colonies n Dalmatia. Though, in a territorial point of view, vassals f the court of Constantinople, these colonies always preserved ne most complete national independence, and formed their wn political governments, according to the exigencies of their ituation. The states which they constituted were of con-iderable weight in the history of Europe; and the kingdoms r bannats of Croatia, Servia, Bosnia, Rascia, and Dalmatia, ccupied for some centuries a political position very similar to nat now held by the secondary monarchical states of the resent day. The people of Narenta, who enjoyed a re-ublican form of government, once disputed the sway of the driatic with the Venetians; and, for some time, it appeared robable that these Servian colonies established by Heraclius ere likely to take a prominent part in advancing the progress f European civilisation.

But, although the ancient provinces of Dalmatia, Illyricum, nd Mœsia, received a new race of inhabitants, and new eographical divisions and names, still several fortified towns n the Adriatic continued to maintain their immediate con-ection with the imperial government, and preserved their riginal population, augmented by numbers of Roman citizens hose wealth enabled them to escape from the Avar invasions nd gain the coast. These towns long supported their unicipal independence by means of the commerce which they

carried on with Italy, and defended themselves against the Servian neighbours by the advantages which they derived from the vicinity of the numerous islands on the Dalmatian coast. For two centuries and a half they continued, though surrounded by Servian tribes, to preserve their direct allegiance to the throne of Constantinople, until at length, in the reign of the Emperor Basil I., they were compelled to become tributary to their Sclavonic neighbours.[1] Ragusa alone ultimately obtained and secured its independence, which it preserved amidst all the vicissitudes of the surrounding countries, until its liberty was finally destroyed by the French, when the conquests of Napoleon annihilated the existence of most of the smaller European republics.

It seems hardly possible that the western Sclavonians, who entered Dalmatia under the various names of Servians, Croatians, Narentins, Zachloumians, Terbounians, Diocleans, and Decatrians, constituted the whole stock of the population. Their numbers could hardly be sufficient to form more than the dominant race at the time of their arrival; and, depopulated as the country was, they probably found some remains of a primitive Sclavonian people who had inhabited the same countries from the earliest periods of history. The remnant of these ancient inhabitants, even if they had been reduced to the condition of agricultural serfs or slaves, would survive the miseries which exterminated their masters, and they had doubtless mingled with the invaders of a kindred race from the northern banks of the Danube, who, ever since the reign of Justinian, had pushed their incursions into the empire. With these people the ruling class of Servian Sclavonians would easily unite without violating any national prejudice. The consequence was natural; the various branches of the population were soon confounded, and their numbers rapidly increased as they melted into one people. The Romans, who at one period had formed a large portion of the inhabitants of these countries, gradually died out, while the Illyrians, who were the neighbours of these colonies to the south, were ultimately pushed down on that part of the continent occupied by the Greeks.

[1] A.D. 867–886. Const. Porphyr. *De Admin. Imp.* c. 30 (vol. iii. 147, edit. Bonn). The small annual tribute paid by these towns to the Eastern emperors, and afterwards to the Sclavonian princes, may be considered as a proof of their poverty on the one hand, and of their virtual independence on the other. In either case it is deserving of particular attention, as an illustration of the state of society. Aspalathus (Spalatro) paid 200 pieces of gold; Tetrangurium (Trau), Opsara, Arbe, Vekla, each 100; Jadera, which is represented by the modern Zara, 110; and Ragusa, for the rural district possessed by its citizens, 72.

From the settlement of the Servian Sclavonians within the bounds of the empire, we may therefore venture to date the earliest encroachments of the Illyrian or Albanian race on the Hellenic population. The Albanians or Arnauts, who are now called by themselves Skiptars, are supposed to be remains of the great Thracian race which, under various names, and more particularly as Paionians, Epirots, and Macedonians, take an important part in early Grecian history.[1] No distinct trace of the period at which they began to be co-proprietors of Greece with the Hellenic race can be found in history; but it is evident that, at whatever time it occurred, the earliest Illyrian or Albanian colonists who settled among the Greeks did so as members of the same political state, and of the same church; that they were influenced by precisely the same feelings and interests, and, what is even more remarkable, that their intrusion occurred under such circumstances that no national prejudices or local jealousies were excited in the susceptible minds of the Greeks. A common calamity of no ordinary magnitude must have produced these wonderful effects; and it seems very difficult to trace back the history of the Greek nation, without suspecting that the germs of their modern condition, like those of their neighbours, are to be sought in the singular events which occurred in the reign of Heraclius.[2]

The power of the Avar monarchy had already declined but the prince or great khakan was still acknowledged as suzerain, from the frontiers of Bavaria to the Dacian Alps, which bound Transylvania and the Bannat, and as far as the shores of the Black Sea, about the mouth of the Danube. The Sclavonian, Bulgarian, and Hunnish tribes, which occupied the country between the Danube and the Wolga, and who had been the earliest subjects of the Avars in Europe, had re-asserted their independence. The actual numerical strength of the Avar nation had never been very great, and their barbarous government everywhere thinned the original

[1] The numbers of the Albanian race are at present estimated by Schafarik not to exceed one million and a half. The Wallachians, Moldavians, and Transylvanians, are composed of a mixture of the true Thracians with Romans and Sclavonians.—Schafarik, *Slavische Alterthumer*, vol. i. p. 31.

[2] The great social distinction which has always existed in the East between the population of the city and of the country, has facilitated the changes and translocations of the rural population.

Some valuable works have been lately published on the history and language of Albania. *Albanesische Studien*, by Dr. Von Hahn, who resided in the country as Austrian Consul, is a valuable volume on this almost unknown subject. Bopp has published a Memoir on the Albanian language in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Berlin.*

population of the lands which they conquered. The remnant of the old inhabitants, driven by poverty and desperation to abandon all industrious pursuits, soon formed bands of robbers, and quickly became as warlike and as numerous as the Avar troops stationed to awe their districts. In a succession of skirmishes and desultory engagements, the Avars soon ceased to maintain their superiority, and the Avar monarchy fell to pieces with nearly as great rapidity as it had arisen. Yet, in the reign of Heraclius, the khakan could still assemble a variety of tribes under his standard whenever he proposed to make a plundering expedition into the provinces of the empire.[1]

It seems impossible to decide, from any historical evidence, whether the measures adopted by Heraclius to circumscribe the Avar power, by the settlement of the Servian Sclavonians in Illyria, preceded or followed a remarkable act of treachery attempted by the Avar monarch against the emperor. If Heraclius had then succeeded in terminating his arrangements with the Servians, the dread of having their power reduced may have appeared to the Avars some apology for an attempt at treachery, too base even for the ordinary latitude of savage revenge and avidity, but which we find repeated by a Byzantine emperor against a king of Bulgaria two centuries later.[2] In the year 619, the Avars made a terrible incursion into the heart of the empire. They advanced so far into Thrace, that when Heraclius proposed a personal meeting with their sovereign, in order to arrange the terms of peace, Heraclea (Perinthus), on the Sea of Marmora, was selected as a convenient spot for the interview. The emperor advanced as far as Selymbria, accompanied by a brilliant train of attendants; and preparations were made to amuse the barbarians with a theatrical festival. The avarice of the Avars was excited, and their sovereign, thinking that any act by which so dangerous an enemy as Heraclius could be removed was pardonable, determined to seize the person of the emperor, while his troops plundered the imperial escort. The great wall was so carelessly guarded, that large bodies of Avar soldiers passed it unnoticed or unheeded; but their movements at last awakened the suspicion of the court, and Heraclius was compelled to fly in disguise to Constantinople, leaving his tents, his theatre, and his household establishment, to be pillaged by his

[1] Georgii Pisidæ *Bellum Avaricum*, v. 197.
[2] A.D. 813. *Byzantine Empire*, vol. i. 135.

treacherous enemies. The followers of the emperor were pursued to the very walls of the capital, and the crowd assembled to grace the festival, became the slaves of the Avars, who carried off an immense booty, and two hundred and seventy thousand prisoners.[1] The weakness of the empire was such, that Heraclius considered it politic to overlook even this insult, and instead of attempting to efface the stain on his reputation, which his ridiculous flight could not fail to produce, he allowed the affair to pass unnoticed. He continued his preparations for attacking Persia, as it was evident that the fate of the Roman empire depended on the success of the war in Asia. To secure himself as much as possible from any diversion in Europe, he condescended to renew his negotiations with the Avars, and by making many sacrifices, he succeeded in concluding a peace on what he vainly hoped might be a lasting basis.

Several years later, however, when Heraclius was absent on the frontiers of Persia, the Avars considered the moment favourable for renewing hostilities, and formed the project of attempting the conquest of Constantinople, in conjunction with a Persian army, which advanced to the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus.[2] The khakan of the Avars, with a powerful army of his own subjects, aided by bands of Sclavonians, Bulgarians, and Huns, attacked the capital by land, while the Persian army endeavoured to afford him every possible assistance by investing the Asiatic suburb and cutting off all supplies on that side. Their combined attacks were defeated by the garrison of Constantinople, without Heraclius considering it necessary to retrace his steps, or turn back from his career of conquest in the East. The naval superiority of the Roman government prevented the junction of its enemies, and the Avars were at last compelled to effect a precipitate retreat. This siege of Constantinople is the last memorable exploit of the Avar nation recorded by the Byzantine historians; their power rapidly declined, and the people soon became so completely lost amidst the Sclavonian and Bulgarian inhabitants of their dominions, that an impenetrable veil is now cast over the history of their race and language. The Bulgarians, who had already acquired some degree of power, began to render themselves the ruling people among the Hunnish

[1] Nicephorus, *De Rebus post Mauricium gestis*, p. 10. It is difficult to read this account of the numbers of the prisoners without a suspicion that some important fact is concealed.

[2] A.D. 626.

nations between the Danube and the Don; and, from this time, they appear in history as the most dangerous enemies of the Roman empire on its northern frontier.

Before Heraclius commenced the arrangements by which he induced the western Sclavonians to settle in Illyria, numerous bodies of the Avars and their Sclavonic subjects had already penetrated into Greece, and established themselves even as far south as the Peloponnesus.[1] No precise evidence of the extent to which the Avars succeeded in pushing their conquests in Greece can now be obtained; but there are testimonies which establish with certainty that their Sclavonic subjects retained possession of these conquests for many centuries. The political and social condition of these Sclavonic colonies on the Hellenic soil, utterly escapes the research of the historian; but their power and influence in Greece was for a long time, very great. The passages of the Greek writers which refer to these conquests are so scanty, and so vague in expression, that it becomes the duty of the modern historian to pass them in review, particularly since they have been employed with much ability by a German writer, to prove that "the Hellenic race in Europe has been exterminated," and that the modern Greeks are a mixed race composed of the descendants of Roman slaves and Sclavonian colonists.[2] This opinion, it is true, has been combated with great learning by one of his countrymen, who asserts that the ingenious dissertation of his predecessor is nothing more than a plausible theory.[3] We must therefore examine for ourselves the scanty records of historical truth during this dark period.

The earliest mention of the Avar conquests in Greece occurs in the Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius of Epiphania, in Cœle-Syria, who wrote at the end of the sixth century.[4] He mentions that, while the forces of the emperor Maurice were engaged in the East, the Avars advanced to the great wall before Constantinople, captured Singidon, Anchialus, and all Greece, and laid waste everything with fire and sword.[5] These

[1] Leake's *Researches in Greece*, 376. Tafel, *De Thessalonica Proleg.* lxxviii. lxxxvii. 70. Theophanes, *Ch.* 385.

[2] *Geschichte der halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters*, von Prof. Fallmerayer, preface, and pp. 179–99.

[3] *Geschichte Griechenlands*, von J. W. Zinkeisen, p. 837.

[4] His history ends with the year 593, and he is supposed to have died not long afterwards.

[5] Evagrii *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 10, cum adnotat. Valesii. Tafel, *Thessalonica Proleg.* lxx. Zinkeisen, 699. Fallmerayer, i. 185. Evagrius appears to mention Singidon, on the extreme western frontier of the empire, and Anchialus, on the Black Sea, in con-

incursions took place in the years 588 and 589, but no inference could be drawn from this vague and incidental notice of an Avar plundering incursion so casually mentioned in favour of the permanent settlement of Sclavonian colonies in Greece, had this passage not received considerable importance from later authorities. The testimony of Evagrius is confirmed in a very remarkable manner by a letter of the patriarch of Constantinople, Nicolaus, to the emperor Alexius Comnenus in the year 1081.[1] The patriarch mentions that the emperor Nicephorus (A.D. 802–811) had granted various concessions to the episcopal see of Patras, in consequence of the miraculous aid which Saint Andrew had afforded that city in destroying the Avars, who had held possession of the greater part of the Peloponnesus for two hundred and eighteen years, and had so completely separated their conquests from the Roman empire that no Roman (that is to say Greek connected with the imperial administration) dared to enter the country. Now this siege of Patras is mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and its date is fixed in the year 807; consequently, these Avars, who had conquered the Peloponnesus two hundred and eighteen years before that event, must have arrived precisely in the year 589, at the very period indicated by Evagrius.[2] The emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus repeatedly mentions the Sclavonian colonies in the Peloponnesus, though he never affords any accurate information concerning the period at which they entered the country. In his work on the provinces of the empire, he informs us that the whole country was subdued and rendered barbarous after the great plague in the reign of Constantine Copronymus, an observation which implies that the complete extermination of the rural population of Hellenic race, and the establishment of the political power of the Sclavonic colonies, and their assumption of total independence in Greece, dated from that period.[3] It is evident that they acquired great power, and became an object of alarm to the emperors, a few years later. In the reign of Constantine VI., an expedition was sent against

unction with all Greece, because his rhetoric and his courtly tone prevented him from telling his readers plainly that the Avars laid waste every province in Europe. A proof that some considerable change took place in the condition of the Greek population of the Peloponnesus during the reign of Maurice, exists in the fact that Monemvasia was then raised to the rank of a Metropolitan see.—Phrantzes, 398, edit. Bonn. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 216.

1 Leunclavius, *Jus Græco-Romanum*, i. 278.

2 Constantinus Porphyr. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 49, iii. 217; edit. Bonn.

3 A.D. 746. Const. Porphyr. *De Thematibus*, ii. c. 6.

them at a time when they possessed great part of the countr from the frontiers of Macedonia to the southern limits of th Peloponnesus.[1] Indeed the fortified towns alone appear t have remained in the possession of the Greeks.[2]

It seems surprising that no detailed account of the importar change in the condition and fortunes of the Greek race, whic these facts imply, is contained in the Byzantine historian Yet, when we reflect that these Sclavonic colonies neve united into one state, nor pursued any fixed line of policy i their attacks on the empire; and when we recall to min also that the Byzantine historians occupied themselves so litt with the real history of mankind as to pass over the Lombar invasion of Italy without notice, our wonder must cease. A the Greek writers who mention this period of history were me connected either with the Constantinopolitan government, c with the orthodox church; and they were consequently dest tute of every feeling of Greek nationality, and viewed th agricultural population of ancient Hellas as a rude an degenerate race of semi-barbarians, little superior to the Scla vonians, with whom they were carrying on a desultory warfare As comparatively little revenue could, in the time of Heraclius be drawn from Greece, that emperor never seems to hav occupied himself about its fate; and the Greeks escaped th extermination with which they were threatened by their Ava and Sclavonian invaders, through the neglect, and not in con sequence of the assistance, of the imperial government. Th Avars made considerable exertions to complete the conque of Greece by carrying their predatory expeditions into th Archipelago. They attacked the eastern coast, which ha hitherto been secure from their invasions, and, to execute thi design, they obtained shipbuilders from the Lombards, an launched a fleet of plundering barks in the Ægean Sea. Th general danger of the islands and commercial cities of Greec roused the spirit of the inhabitants, who united for the defenc of their property, and the plans of the Avars proved unsuccess ful.[3] The Greeks, however, were long exposed to the plunder ing Sclavonians on one side, and to the rapacity of th imperial government on the other; and their success in preserv ing some portion of their commercial wealth and politica

[1] A.D. 783. Theophanes, *Ch.* 385. See also the *Epitome* to Strabo, in the editio of Almeloveen. Amst. 1707, pp. 1251, 1261.

[2] Joannina maintained itself always as a Greek city.—Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, iv. 202.

[3] Paulus Diaconus, *De Gestis Langob.* iv. 21. Tafel, *Thessalonica Prolog.* lxxii lxxix.

influence, is to be attributed to the efficacy of their municipal organisation, and to the weakness of the central government, which could no longer prevent their bearing arms for their own defence.

Section VII

Influence of the Campaigns of Heraclius in the East

The personal character of Heraclius must have exercised great influence on the events of his reign. Unfortunately, the historians of his age have not conveyed to posterity any very accurate picture of the peculiar traits of his mind. His conduct shows that he possessed judgment, activity, and courage; and, though he was sometimes imprudent and rash, at others he displayed an equanimity and force of character in repressing his passion, which mark him to have been really a great man.[1] In the opinion of his contemporaries, his fame was sullied by two indelible stains. His marriage with his niece Martina was regarded as incestuous, and his religious edicts, by which he proposed to regulate the faith of his subjects, were branded as heretical. Both were serious errors of policy in a prince who was so dependent on public opinion for support in his great scheme of restoring the lost power of the Roman empire; yet the constancy of his affection for his wife, and the immense importance of reconciling all the adverse sects of Christians within the empire in common measures of defence against external enemies, may form some apology for these errors. The patriarch of Constantinople remonstrated against his marriage with his niece; but the power of the emperor was still absolute over the persons of the ecclesiastical functionaries of the empire; and Heraclius, though he allowed the bishop to satisfy his conscience by stating his objections, commanded him to practise his civil duties, and celebrate the marriage of his sovereign. The pretensions of papal Rome had not yet arisen in the Christian church.[2] The Patriarch Sergius

[1] His cruelty to Phocas only proves that he partook of the barbarous feelings of his age. A religious strain runs through his letters, which are preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle*, and in the speeches reported by Theophanes, which have an air of authenticity. It is true that this style may have been the official language of an emperor, who felt himself so peculiarly the head of the Christian church, and the champion of the orthodox faith. Persia was his ecclesiastical as well as his political enemy.

[2] The power of Gregory the Great was so small that he durst not consecrate a bishop without the consent of his enemy the emperor Maurice; and he was forced to obey the edict forbidding all persons to quit public employments in order to become monks, and prohibiting soldiers during the period of their service from being received into monasteries.—Fleury. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* l. 35, 50; 36, 43.

does not appear to have been deficient in zeal or courage, and Heraclius was not free from the religious bigotry of his age. Both knew that the established church was a part of the State, and that though in matters of doctrine the general councils put limits to the imperial authority, yet, in the executive direction of the clergy, the emperor was nearly absolute, and possessed full power to remove the patriarch had he ventured to disobey his orders. As the marriage of Heraclius with Martina was within the prohibited degrees, it was an act of unlawful compliance on the part of Sergius to celebrate the nuptials, for the duty of the patriarch as a Christian priest was surely, in such a case, of more importance than his obedience as a Roman subject.

The early part of the reign of Heraclius was devoted to reforming the administration and recruiting the army. He tried every means of obtaining peace with Persia in vain, and even allowed the senate to make an independent attempt to enter into negotiations with Chosroes.[1] For twelve years, the Persian armies ravaged the empire almost without encountering any opposition, from the banks of the Nile to the shores of the Bosphorus. It is impossible to explain in what manner Heraclius employed his time during this interval, but it is evident that he was engaged by many cares besides those of preparing for his war with Persia. The independent negotiation which the senate attempted with Persia, seems to indicate that the Roman aristocracy had succeeded in encroaching on the emperor's authority during the general confusion which reigned in the administration after the fall of Maurice, and that he may have been occupied with a political contest at home before he could attend to the exigencies of the Persian war. As no civil hostilities appear to have broken out, the circumstance is not recorded in the meagre chronicles of his reign. This may perhaps seem a random conjecture, which ought not to find a place in a historical work; but when the state of the Roman administration at the close of the reign of Heraclius is compared with the confusion in which he found it at his accession, it is evident that he had succeeded in effecting a great political change, and in infusing new vigour into the weakened fabric of the government.

When Heraclius had settled the internal affairs of his empire, filled his military chest, and re-established the discipline of the Roman armies, he commenced a series of campaigns.

[1] *Chronicon Paschale*, 387.

which entitle him to rank as one of the greatest military commanders whose deeds are recorded in history.[1] The great object which he proposed to himself in his first campaign, was to render himself master of a line of communications extending from the shores of the Black Sea to those of the Mediterranean, and resting on positions in Pontus and Cilicia.[2] The Persian armies, which had advanced into Asia Minor and occupied Ancyra, would, by this manœuvre, be separated from supplies and reinforcements on their own frontiers, and Heraclius would have it in his power to attack their troops in detail. The rapidity of his movements rendered his plan successful; the Persians were compelled to fight in the positions chosen by Heraclius, and were completely defeated. In the second campaign, the emperor pushed forward into the heart of Persia from his camp in Pontus.[3] Ganzaca was captured; Thebarmes, the birthplace of Zoroaster, with its temple and fire-altars, was destroyed; and after laying waste the northern part of Media, Heraclius retired to Albania, where he placed his army in winter quarters. This campaign proved to the world that the Persian empire was in the same state of internal weakness as the Roman, and equally incapable of offering any popular or national resistance to an active and enterprising enemy.[4] The third and fourth campaigns were occupied in laborious marches and severe battles, in which Heraclius proved himself both a brave soldier and an able general. Under his guidance, the Roman troops recovered all their ancient superiority in war. At the end of the third campaign, he established their winter quarters in the Persian dominions, and at the conclusion of the fourth he led his army back into Asia Minor, to winter behind the Halys, that he might be able to watch the movements concerted between the Persians and the Avars, for the attack of

1 The industry of Lebeau, the learning of Gibbon, and the sagacity of D'Anville, have been employed in illustrating the chronology and geography of the campaigns of Heraclius; but something still requires to be done to enable us to follow his steps with certainty, and the labour of a scholar might be advantageously bestowed on this interesting period. D'Anville and Gibbon place Ganzaca at Tabreez, but Colonel Rawlinson has given reasons for placing it at Takht-i-Soleiman.—*Journal R. Geograph. Soc.* vol. x. The site of Thebarmes is generally placed at Urimiyeh.

2 A.D. 622.

3 A.D. 623.

4 Gibbon countenances the opinion that Heraclius penetrated as far as Ispahan, but this rests on a very doubtful conjecture.—Chap. xlvi. vol. v. 403. In order to gain allies against Persia, Heraclius promised his daughter in marriage to the son of the king, or chief, of the Khazars, a Turkish tribe who were, for some centuries, powerful in the countries between the Black Sea and the Caspian. Lebeau, xi. 115,—Notes de S. M.

"A senator of Rome, while Rome survived,
Would not have match'd his daughter with a king."

Constantinople. The fifth campaign was at first suspended by the presence of the Persian army on the shores of the Bosphorus, in order to assist the Avars in the siege of Constantinople. Heraclius, having divided his forces into three armies, sent one to the relief of Constantinople; the second, which he placed under the command of his brother Theodore, defeated the Persians in a great battle; and with the third he took up a position in Iberia, where he waited to hear that the Khazars had invaded Persia. As soon as he was informed that his Turkish allies had passed the Caspian gates, and was assured that the attempt on his capital had failed, he hastened to advance into the very heart of the Persian empire, and to seek his rival in his palace. The sixth campaign opened with the Roman army in the plains of Assyria; and, after laying waste some of the richest provinces of the Persian empire, Heraclius marched through the country to the east of the Tigris, and captured the palace of Dastargerd, where the Persian monarchs had accumulated the greatest part of their enormous treasures, in a position always regarded as secure from any foreign enemy. Chosroes fled at the approach of the Roman army, and his flight became a signal for the rebellion of his generals. Heraclius pushed forward to within a few miles of Ctesiphon, and then found that his success would be more certain by watching the civil dissensions of the Persians, than by risking an attack on the populous capital of their empire with his diminished army. The emperor led his army back to Ganzaca in the month of March, and the seventh spring terminated the war. Chosroes was seized and murdered by his rebellious son Siroes, and a treaty of peace was concluded with the Roman emperor. The ancient frontiers of the two empires were re-established, and the holy cross, which the Persians had carried off from Jerusalem, was restored to Heraclius, with the seals of the case which contained it unbroken.[1]

Heraclius had repeatedly declared that he did not desire to make any conquest of Persian territory.[2] His conduct when success had crowned his exertions, and when his enemy was ready to purchase his retreat at any price, proves the sincerity

[1] See the chronology of the campaigns of Heraclius in the table at the commencement of this volume.

If the site now shown as that of the Holy Sepulchre be suppositious, no period was better adapted to the fraud than the reign of Heraclius, yet even then it appears impossible.—See "Observations on the Site of the Holy Sepulchre." Appendix, No. III.

[2] *Chronicon Paschale*, 401.

and justice of his policy. His empire required not only a lasting peace to recover from the miseries of the late war, but also many reforms in the civil and religious administration, which could only be completed during such a peace, in order to restore the vigour of the government. Twenty-four years of a war, which had proved, in turns, unsuccessful to every nation engaged in it, had impoverished and diminished the population of a great part of Europe and Asia. Public institutions and buildings, roads, ports, and commerce, had fallen into decay; the physical power of governments had declined; and the utility of a central political authority became less and less apparent to mankind. Even the religious opinions of the subjects of the Roman and Persian empires had been shaken by the misfortunes which had happened to what each sect regarded as the talisman of its faith. The ignorant Christians viewed the capture of Jerusalem, and the loss of the holy cross, as indicating the wrath of heaven and the downfall of religion; and the fire-worshippers considered the destruction of Thebarmes, and the extinction of the sacred fire, as an irreparable evil, and ominous of the annihilation of every good principle on earth. Both the Persians and the Christians had so long regarded their faith as a portion of the State, and reckoned political and military power as the inseparable allies of their ecclesiastical establishments, that they considered their religious misfortune as a proof of the divine reprobation. Both the orthodox magians and the orthodox Christians believed that they saw the abomination of desolation in their holy places, and their traditions and their prophets told them that this was the sign which was to herald the approach of the last great and terrible day.

The fame of Heraclius would have rivalled that of Alexander, Hannibal, or Cæsar, had he expired at Jerusalem, after the successful termination of the Persian war. He had established peace throughout the empire, restored the strength of the Roman government, revived the power of Christianity in the East, and replanted the holy cross on Mount Calvary. His glory admitted of no addition. Unfortunately, the succeeding years of his reign have, in the general opinion, tarnished his fame. Yet these years were devoted to many arduous labours; and it is to the wisdom with which he restored the strength of his government during this time of peace that we must attribute the energy of the Asiatic Greeks who arrested the great tide of Mohammedan conquest at the

foot of Mount Taurus. Though the military glory of Heraclius was obscured by the brilliant victories of the Saracens, still his civil administration ought to receive its meed of praise, when we compare the resistance made by the empire which he reorganised with the facility which the followers of Mahomet found in extending their conquests over every other land from India to Spain.

The policy of Heraclius was directed to the establishment of a bond of union, which should connect all the provinces of his empire into one body, and he hoped to replace the want of national unity by identity of religious belief. The church was far more closely connected with the people than any other institution, and the emperor, as political head of the church, hoped to direct a well-organised body of churchmen. But Heraclius engaged in the impracticable task of imposing a rule of faith on his subjects, without assuming the office, or claiming the authority of a prophet or a saint. His measures, consequently, like all ecclesiastical and religious reforms which are adopted solely from political motives, only produced additional discussions and difficulties. In the year 630 he propounded the doctrine "that in Christ, after the union of the two natures, there was but one will and one operation." Without gaining over any great body of the schismatics whom he wished to restore to the communion of the established church, by his new rule of faith, he was himself generally stigmatised as a heretic. The epithet monothelite was applied to him and to his doctrine, to show that neither was orthodox. In the hope of putting an end to the disputes which he had rashly awakened, he again, in 639, attempted to legislate for the church, and published his celebrated Ecthesis, which, though it attempts to remedy the effects of his prior proceedings, by forbidding all controversy on the question of the single or double operation of the will in Christ, nevertheless includes a declaration in favour of unity.[1] The bishop of Rome, already aspiring after an increase of his spiritual authority, though perhaps not yet contemplating the possibility of perfect independence, entered actively into the opposition excited by the publication of the Ecthesis, and was supported by a considerable party in the Eastern church, while he directed the proceedings of the whole of the Western clergy.

On a careful consideration of the religious position of the empire, it cannot appear surprising that Heraclius should

[1] The *Ecthesis* is contained in Hardouin's *Concilia*, tom. ii. 791.

have endeavoured to reunite the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Jacobites, to the established church, particularly when we remember how closely the influence of the church was connected with the administration of the State, and how completely religious passions replaced national feelings in these secondary ages of Christianity. The union was an indispensable step to the re-establishment of the imperial power in the provinces of Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Armenia; and it must not be overlooked that the theological speculations and ecclesiastical reforms of Heraclius were approved of by the wisest councillors whom he had been able to select to aid him in the government of the empire. The state of society required some strong remedy, and Heraclius only erred in adopting the plan which had always been pursued by absolute monarchs, namely, that of making the sovereign's opinion the rule of conduct for his subjects. We can hardly suppose that Heraclius would have succeeded better, had he assumed the character or deserved the veneration due to a saint. The marked difference which existed between the higher and educated classes in the East, and the ignorant and superstitious populace, rendered it next to impossible that any line of conduct could secure the judgment of the learned, and awaken the fanaticism of the people. As a farther apology for Heraclius, it may be noticed that his acknowledged power over the orthodox clergy was much greater than that which was possessed by the Byzantine emperors at a later period, or that which was admitted by the Latin church after its separation. In spite of all the advantages which he possessed, his attempt ended in a most signal failure; yet no experience could ever induce his successors to avoid his error. His effort to strengthen his power, by establishing a principle of unity, aggravated all the evils which he intended to cure; for while the Monophysites and the Greeks were as little disposed to unite as ever, the authority of the Eastern church, as a body, was weakened by the creation of a new schism, and the incipient divisions between the Greeks and the Latins, assuming a national character, began to prepare the way for the separation of the two churches.

While Heraclius was endeavouring to restore the strength of the empire in the East, and enforce unity of religious views, the pursuit of which has ever been one of the greatest errors of the human mind,—Mahomet, by a juster application of the aspiration of mankind after unity, had succeeded in

uniting Arabia into one state, and in persuading it to adopt one religion. The force of this new empire of the Saracens was directed against those provinces of the Roman empire which Heraclius had been anxiously endeavouring to reunite in spirit to his government. The difficulties of their administration had compelled the emperor to fix his residence for some years in Syria, and he was well aware of the uncertainty of their allegiance, before the Saracens commenced their invasion.[1] The successes of the Mohammedan arms, and the retreat of the emperor, carrying off with him the holy cross from Jerusalem, have induced historians to suppose that his latter years were spent in sloth, and marked by weakness.[2] His health, however, was in so precarious a state, that he could no longer direct the operations of his army in person; at times, indeed, he was incapable of all bodily exertion.[3] Yet the resistance which the Saracens encountered in Syria was very different from the ease with which it had yielded to the Persians at the commencement of the emperor's reign; and attests that his administration had not been without fruit. Many of his reforms could only have been effected after the conclusion of the Persian war, when he recovered possession of Syria and Egypt. He seems, indeed, never to have omitted an opportunity of strengthening his position; and when a chief of the Huns or Bulgarians threw off his allegiance to the Avars, Heraclius is recorded to have immediately availed himself of the opportunity to form an alliance, in order to circumscribe the power of his dangerous northern enemy. Unfortunately, few traces can be gleaned from the Byzantine writers of the precise acts by which he effected his reforms: and the most remarkable facts, illustrating the political history of the time, must be collected from incidental notices, preserved in the treatise of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, concerning the administration of the empire, written for the instruction of his son Romanus, in the middle of the tenth century.[4]

Though Heraclius failed in gaining over the Syrians and Egyptians, yet he succeeded completely in reuniting the Greeks of Asia Minor to his government, and in attaching them

1 Heraclius resided almost entirely in the East, from A.D. 622 to 625.

2 Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ix. 418. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xi. 173.

3 Niceph. Cap. 17. Ockley's *History of the Saracens*, i. 271. The story of the Arabian historian, mentioned by Ockley, confirms the account of the patriarch Nicephorus, and shows that the health of Heraclius had declined before he quitted Syria.

4 Published in *Banduri Imperium Orientale*, fol. Paris, 1711, tom. i., and in the third volume of the Bonn edition of the works of Constantine Porph.

:o the empire. His success may be estimated from the failure of the Saracens in their attacks on the population of this province. The moment the Mohammedan armies were compelled to rely on their military skill and religious enthusiam, and were unable to derive any profit from the hostile feeling of he inhabitants to the imperial government, their career of conquest was checked; and almost a century before Charles Martel stopped their progress in the west of Europe, the Greeks had arrested their conquests in the East, by the steady esistance which they offered in Asia Minor.

The difficulties of Heraclius were very great. The Roman rmies were still composed of a rebellious soldiery collected rom many discordant nations; and the only leaders whom the mperor could venture to trust with important military commands, were his immediate relations, like his brother Theodore, nd his son Heraclius Constantine, or soldiers of fortune who ould not aspire at the imperial dignity.[1] The apostasy and reachery of a considerable number of the Roman officers in yria, warranted Heraclius in regarding the defence of that rovince as utterly hopeless; but the meagre historians of his eign can hardly be received as conclusive authorities, to prove hat on his retreat he displayed an unseemly despair, or a riminal indifference. The fact that he carried the holy cross, hich he had restored to Jerusalem, along with him to Constantinople, attests that he had lost all expectation of defending the Holy City; but his exclamation of "Farewell, Syria!" as doubtless uttered in the bitterness of his heart, on seeing great part of the labours of his life for the restoration of ne Roman empire utterly vain. The disease which had long ndermined his constitution, put an end to his life about five ears after his return to Constantinople. He died in March, 41, after one of the most remarkable reigns recorded in istory, chequered by the greatest successes and reverses, uring which the social condition of mankind underwent a onsiderable change, and the germs of modern society began to rout; yet there is, unfortunately, no period of man's annals overed with greater obscurity.

[1] Theophanes, *Chron.* 280. Eutychius, ii. 273. Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.* 26.

Section VIII

CONDITION OF THE NATIVE POPULATION OF GREECE

The history of the European Greeks becomes extremel obscure after the reign of Justinian. Yet this period is one c great interest in the history of the Hellenic race, which wa reduced, like most of the others, to struggle hard to escape exte mination from invaders far inferior in power and civilisatior It has been already mentioned that the Avar and Sclavonia tribes had penetrated into Greece in considerable number and effected settlements in many districts, from which the waged a perpetual war with the Greeks. Unable to live i the state of misery and destitution to which the agricultura classes were now reduced in Europe, the Greek race confine itself to the towns where it could carry on trade, or to thos districts which were defended by permanent garrisons.

The Thracian race had always effectually resisted th influence of Greek civilisation ; and even when the populatio of Greece was increasing with the greatest rapidity, and whil its colonies were multiplied in every land, from Sicily to th Tauric Chersonese, the Greeks were unable to press bac towards the north the population of the border regions c Epirus and Macedonia, much less of the great Thracian plair between the Ægean Sea and the Danube. Yet these land have from the earliest times lain open to constant invasio and emigration.[1] In the time of Maurice, the language of th Thracians had a much stronger resemblance to Latin than t Greek, and indeed Latin appears to have mixed more easil than Greek with the native dialects of all the nations on th northern limits of the Hellenic race.[2]

It is impossible to trace with accuracy the effects of th depopulation of Greece, and of the poverty of the inhab tants. No description could exaggerate the sufferings of country in a similar situation.[3] The slaves who had formerl

[1] From the time of the Celts to that of the Turks.—Niebuhr's *Kleine Schriften* 375.

[2] Ἕτερος προσφωνεῖ τῇ πατρώᾳ φωνῇ τόρνα φράτρε.—Theophanes, *Ol.* 218.- Theophylact. Sim. ii. 15. This was the language of the Muleteers. The prevalen opinion at present seems to be that the Vallachian language represents the ancie Thracian, and that the Albanian is a dialect of the language of Macedonia an Epirus.

[3] Niebuhr thus describes the effects of the wars of Napoleon in Germany : "Who villages have entirely disappeared ; and in many, which are not altogether gone, th population is entirely, or almost entirely, destroyed by plunder, famine, and diseas The towns, part of which are in ashes, are equally desolate ; and every inhabitant

aboured for the wealthy had now disappeared, and the free abourer had sunk into a serf. The uncultivated plains were raversed by armed bands of Sclavonians, who gradually ettled in great numbers in Macedonia and the Peloponnesus. The cities of Greece ceased to receive the usual supplies of gricultural produce from the country, and even Thessalonica vith its fertile territory and abundant pastures, was dependent on foreign importations of grain for relief from famine.[1] The maller cities, destitute of the same advantages of situation, would naturally be more exposed to depopulation, and sink more rapidly to decay. Roads, bridges, aqueducts, and quays were everywhere allowed to fall to ruin after the confiscation of the municipal revenues of the Greek cities by Justinian, and the transport of provisions by land, in a country like Greece, became difficult. This neglect of the roads had always been a cause of poverty and barbarism in the mountainous districts of the Roman empire, even during the period of its greatest prosperity, for the central government paid no attention to any roads but those connected with the great military lines of communication.

A complete opposition of feelings and interests now began to separate the inhabitants of Greece from the Greek population connected with the imperial administration. This circumstance warrants us in fixing on the reign of Heraclius as the period at which the ancient existence of the Hellenic race terminates. It is vain to attempt to fix with accuracy the precise time at which the ancient usages were allowed, one by one, to expire, for no change in social life which is long in progress, can be considered as really accomplished, until the existence of a new order of things can be distinctly pointed out. National transitions can rarely be effected in one generation, and are often not completed in a century. But when the Byzantine writers, after the time of Heraclius, find it necessary to mention the Greeks of Hellas and Peloponnesus, they do so with feelings of contempt. This display of ill will induces us to conjecture that the fate of the Greek cities engaged in resisting the Sclavonian invaders had not been very

ink nearly to the same state of poverty. Almost all the landowners are bankrupt, and here has been a total change in the property of the soil—a great misfortune, for the ch who spring up out of war and want are sure to be the very worst of their class." *ebens nachrichten uber* B. G. Niebuhr, 424. In order to form some idea of the state Greece, add to this picture the difference between a declining and advancing state of ciety, and between the French of the nineteenth century and the Avars and Sclanians of the seventh.

[1] Tafel, *De Thessalonica ejusque Agro.* proleg. lxviii.

different from that of the imperial cities on the Adriatic, an that they had been compelled to develop a spirit of indepen dence, which had caused a return of prosperity sufficient t awaken the envy of the Byzantine Greeks.

The inhabitants of Greece are called Helladikoi, to dis tinguish them alike from the ancient Hellenes and from th Romans of the empire. This expression seems almost t imply envy as well as contempt.[1] The term Hellenes wa now either used to indicate the votaries of paganism, or wa too closely associated with reminiscences of the glory of ancien Hellas, to be conferred on the rude Christian population of th Peloponnesus, by the courtiers of Constantinople, the pro totypes of the hated Phanariots.

In the midst of the darkness which conceals the politica and social condition of the Greeks from our view during th period, a curious record of a later time informs us that portion of the Hellenic race, in the mountains of Laconia still continued to preserve its ancient habits, and even clun to the pagan religion.[2] This circumstance supplies th strongest testimony of the neglected and secluded conditio of the people, among whom the ideas of the enlightene portion of mankind had not succeeded in penetrating. Thes heathens were, of course, only uninstructed peasantry, wh had preserved some of the superstitious usages of the ancestors, and who, probably, were not more ignorant of th ideas and feelings of ancient paganism than they were c Christian doctrines.

The barbarism of the Greeks at this period was the con sequence of their poverty, which prevented their procurin the means of education, and restricted the uses of the know ledge which they might possess. In the circumstances t which they were reduced, it is not surprising that the Greek lost all veneration both for literature and art, and that Greece for some centuries, hardly furnishes a single name in th long list of Greek writers whose works have been considere worthy of mention. In this state of depopulation and ignor ance, the relics of ancient art began to fall unnoticed to th ground: another age covered them with the ruins of th buildings which they had once adorned; and thus man remained concealed and preserved, until increasing popu

[1] Theophanes, *Ch.* 339. Cedrenus, i. 454. Tafel, *De Thessalonica*, proleg. lxx 221, 513.

[2] Constantin. Porphyr. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 50, iii. 224; edit. Bonn.

ation, and reviving prosperity, caused the reconstruction of ew cities.

It was not in their native seats alone that the Greeks eclined in numbers and civilisation at this period; even heir distant colonies were rapidly sinking to ruin. During he reign of Justin, the city of Bosporus, in Tauris, had been aptured by the Turks, who then occupied a considerable ortion of the Tauric Chersonesus.[1] The city of Cherson lone continued to maintain its independence, in the northern egions of the Black Sea, resembling, in its political relation o the empire, the cities of Dalmatia, and by its share of the orthern trade, balancing the power and influence of the arbarian princes in the neighbourhood.

[1] *Excerpta e Menandri Historia*, 404, edit. Bonn.

CHAPTER V

CONDITION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE MOHAMMEDA INVASION OF SYRIA TO THE EXTINCTION OF TH ROMAN POWER IN THE EAST. A.D. 633–716.

The Roman empire gradually changed into the Byzantine—Conquest of t southern provinces of the empire, of which the majority of the popu tion was not Greek nor orthodox—Constans II. followed the policy Heraclius—Constantine IV. yielded to the popular ecclesiastical pa among the Greeks—Depopulation of the empire, and decrease of t Greeks under Justinian II.—Anarchy in the administration until t accession of Leo III.—General view of the condition of the Greekss the extinction of the Roman power in the East.

SECTION I

THE ROMAN EMPIRE GRADUALLY CHANGED INTO THE BYZANTINE

THE precise date at which the eastern Roman empire ceas to exist has been variously fixed. Gibbon remarks, "th Tiberius by the Arabs, and Maurice by the Italians, are d tinguished as the first of the Greek Cæsars, as the founders a new dynasty and empire."[1] But if manners, language, a religion are to decide concerning the commencement of t Byzantine empire, the preceding pages have shown that i origin must be carried back to an earlier period; while, if t administrative peculiarities in the form of government be take as the ground of decision, the Roman empire may be co sidered as indefinitely prolonged with the existence of the tit of Roman emperor, which the sovereigns of Constantinop continued to retain as long as Constantinople was ruled Christian princes. While the prejudices of the governi classes, both in Church and State, kept them completely sep rated from the national feelings of every race of their subject and rendered the imperial administration, and the people the empire, two distinct bodies, with different, and frequent adverse views and interests, the spirit of Roman dominati continued to animate the government, and guide the counci of the emperor. The period, therefore, at which the Rom

[1] Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vii. 38, chap. liii.

npire of the East terminated, is decided by the events which onfined the authority of the imperial government to those rovinces where the Greeks formed the majority of the popu- tion; and it is marked by the adoption of Greek as the nguage of the government, by the prevalence of Greek vilisation, and by the identification of the nationality of the eople, and the policy of the emperors with the Greek church. or, when the Saracen conquests had severed from the empire l those provinces which possessed a native population dis- nct from the Greeks, by language, literature, and religion, the ntral government of Constantinople was gradually compelled fall back on the interests and passions of the remaining habitants, who were chiefly Greeks; and though Roman inciples of administration continued to exercise a powerful fluence in separating the aristocracy, both in Church and ate, from the body of the people, still public opinion, among e educated classes, began to exert some influence on the lministration, and that public opinion was in its character ally Greek. Yet, as it was by no means identified with the terests and feelings of the native inhabitants of Hellas, it ight correctly to be termed Byzantine, and the empire is, nsequently, justly called the Byzantine empire. As the lics of the Macedonian empire at last overpowered the oman element in the Eastern Empire, the court of Con- antinople became identified with the feelings and interests of at portion of the Greek nation which, in Asia, owed its olitical existence to the Macedonian conquests; and on the mbers, wealth, and power of this class, the emperor and the thodox church were, after the commencement of the eighth ntury, compelled to depend for the defence of the govern- ent and the Christian religion.

The difficulty of fixing the precise moment which marks the d of the Roman empire, arises from the circumstance of its ving perished, rather from the internal evils nourished in its olitical organisation, than from the attacks of its external emies. The termination of the Roman power was con- quently nothing more than the reform of a corrupt and anti- ated government, and its transformation into a new state by e power of time and circumstance was feebly aided by the ellects and acts of superstitious and servile men. The oths, Huns, Avars, Persians, and Saracens, all failed as com- etely in overthrowing the Roman empire, as the Moham- edans did in destroying the Christian religion. For even

the final loss of Syria, Egypt, and Africa only reveals the tran formation of the Roman empire, when the consequences the change begin to produce visible effects on the intern government. The Roman empire seems, therefore, really t have terminated with the anarchy which followed the murd of Justinian II., the last sovereign of the family of Heraclius and Leo III., or the Isaurian, who identified the imperi administration with ecclesiastical forms and questions, must b ranked as the first of the Byzantine monarchs, though neith the emperor, the clergy, nor the people perceived at the tim the moral change in their position, which makes the establish ment of this new era historically correct.

Under the sway of the Heraclian family, the extent of th empire was circumscribed nearly within the bounds which continued to occupy during many subsequent centuries. A this diminution of territory was chiefly caused by the sepa ration of provinces, inhabited by people of different race manners, and opinions, and placed, by a concurrence of ci cumstances, in opposition to the central government, it is n improbable that the empire was actually strengthened by th loss. The connection between the Constantinopolitan cou and the Greek nation became closer; and though this conne tion, in so far as it affected the people, was chiefly based o religious and not on political feelings, and operated wit greater force on the inhabitants of the cities than on the whol body of the population, still its effect was extremely beneficia to the imperial government.

While the Roman and Persian empires, ruined by the devastating wars, had rapidly declined in wealth, power, an population, two nations had grown up to the possession of greatly increased importance, and taken their place as arbite of the fate of mankind. The Turks in the north of Asia, an the Arabs in the south, were now the most numerous and th most powerful nations in immediate contact with the civilise portion of mankind. The Turkish power of this time, how ever, never came into direct military relations with the Roma empire, nor did the conquests of this race immediately affe the political and social condition of the Greeks, until som centuries later.[1] With the Arabs or Saracens the case wa very different. As they were placed on the confines of Syri

[1] The Turks, by their wars with Persia at this period, facilitated the conquest of th Persian empire by the Arabs. There is an excellent description of the Saracens befo the time of Mahomet in Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv. 4.

Egypt, and Persia, the disturbances caused by the wars of Heraclius and Chosroes threw a considerable portion of the rich trade with Ethiopia, Southern Africa, and India into their hands. The long hostilities between the two empires gave a constant occupation to the warlike population of Arabia, and directed the attention of the Arabs to views of extended national policy. The natural advantages of their unrivalled cavalry were augmented by habits of order and discipline, which they could never have acquired in their native deserts. The Saracens in the service of the empire are spoken of with praise by Heraclius in his last campaign, when they accompanied him into the heart of Persia.[1] The profits derived from their increased commercial and military adventures had doubtless given the population of Arabia a tendency to increase. The edict of Justinian, which prohibited the exportation of grain from every port of Egypt except Alexandria, must have closed the canal of Suez, and put an end to the trade on the Red Sea, or at least thrown whatever trade remained into the hands of the Arabians.[2] Their intimate connection with the Roman and Persian armies had revealed to them the weakness of the two empires; yet the extraordinary power and conquests of the Arabs must be attributed, rather to the moral strength which the nation acquired by the influence of their prophet Mahomet, than to the extent of their improvement in military or political knowledge. The difference in the social circumstances of a declining and an advancing population must not be lost sight of in weighing the relative strength of nations, which appear the most dissimilar in wealth and population, and even in the extent of their military establishments. Nations which, like the inhabitants of the Roman and Persian empires in the seventh century, expend their whole revenues, public and private, in the course of the year, though composed of numerous and wealthy subjects, may prove weak when a sudden emergency requires extraordinary exertion; while a people with scanty revenues and small resources may, from its frugal habits and constant activity, command a larger superfluity of its annual revenues for great public works or military enterprises. In one case it may be impossible to assemble more than one-twentieth of the population under arms; in the other it may be possible to take the field with one-fifth.

[1] *Chronicon Paschale*, 318.
[2] *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Edict xiii., "De Alexandrinis et Ægyptiacis provinciis."

Section II

Conquest of the Southern Provinces of the Empire of which the Majority of the Population was not Greek nor Orthodox

Strange as were the vicissitudes in the fortunes of the Persian and Roman empires during the reigns of Chosroes and Heraclius, every event in their records sinks into comparative insignificance, from the mighty influence which their contemporary Mahomet, the prophet of Arabia, soon began to exercise on the political, moral, and religious condition of the countries whose possession these sovereigns had so eagerly disputed. Historians are apt to be enticed from their immediate subject, in order to contemplate the personal history of a man who obtained so marvellous a dominion over the minds and actions of his followers; and whose talents laid the foundations of a political and religious system, which has ever since continued to govern millions of mankind, of various races and dissimilar manners. The success of Mahomet as a lawgiver, among the most ancient nations of Asia, and the stability of his institutions during a long series of generations and in every condition of social polity, proved that this extraordinary man was formed by a rare combination of the qualities both of a Lycurgus and an Alexander. But still, in order to appreciate with perfect justness the influence of Mahomet on his own times, it is safer to examine the history of his contemporaries with reference to his conduct, and to fix our attention exclusively on his actions and opinions, than to trace from them the exploits of his followers, and attribute to them the rapid propagation of his religion. Even though it be admitted that Mahomet laid the foundations of his laws in the strongest principles of human nature, and prepared the fabric of his empire with the profoundest wisdom, still there can be no doubt that the intelligence of no man could, during his lifetime, have foreseen, and no combinations on the part of one individual could have insured, the extraordinary success of his followers. The laws which govern the moral world insure permanent success, even to the greatest minds, only as long as they form types of the mental feelings of their fellow creatures. The circumstances of the age in which Mahomet lived, were indeed favourable to his career: they formed the

ınd of this wonderful man, who has left their impress, as ell as that of his own character, on succeeding generations. [e was born at a period of visible intellectual decline amongst ıe aristocratic and governing classes throughout the civilised orld. Aspirations after something better than the then social ɔndition of the bulk of mankind, had rendered the in-ıbitants of almost every country dissatisfied with the existing ·der of things. A better religion than the paganism of the rabs was felt to be necessary in Arabia; and, at the same me, even the people of Persia, Syria, and Egypt, required ɔmething more satisfactory to their religious feelings than the sputed doctrines which the Magi, Jews, and Christians in-ılcated as the most important features of their respective ligions, merely because they presented the points of greatest ssimilarity. The great success of Mani in propagating a ɐw religion (for Manicheism cannot properly be called a ɐresy) is a strong testimony of this feeling. The fate, too, the Manicheans, would probably have foreshadowed that the Mohammedans, had the religion of Mahomet not esented to foreign nations a national cause as well as an ıiversal creed. Had Mahomet himself met with the fate of ani, it is not probable that his religion would have been ore successful than that of his predecessor. But he found a ıole nation in the full tide of rapid improvement, eagerly in arch of knowledge and power. The excitement in the ıblic mind of Arabia, which produced the mission of ahomet, induced many other prophets to make their appear-ce during his lifetime. His superior talents, and his clearer rception of justice, and, we may say, truth, destroyed all eir schemes.[1]

The misfortunes of the times had directed public opinion in e East to a belief that unity was the thing principally want-g to cure the existing evils, and secure the permanent ppiness of mankind. This vague desire of unity is indeed uncommon delusion of the human intellect. Mahomet ·zed the idea; his creed, "there is but one God," was a ıth that insured universal assent; the addition, "and ahomet is the prophet of God," was a simple fact, which, if ubted, admitted of an appeal to the sword, an argument ıt, even to the minds of the Christian world, was long con-lered as an appeal to God. The principle of unity was

[1] Ockley's *Hist. of the Saracens*, i. 13, edit. 1757. Sale's *Koran*, Prel. Dis. i. 238. bon's *Decline and Fall*, chap. li.

soon embodied in the frame of Arabic society; the unity God, the national unity of the Arabs, and the unity of th religious, civil, judicial, and military administration, in or organ on earth, entitled the Mohammedans to assume, wit justice, the name of Unitarians, a title in which they partic larly gloried.[1] Such sentiments, joined to the declaratic made and long kept by the Saracens, that liberty of conscien was granted to all who would put themselves under the pr tection of Islam, were enough to secure the goodwill of th numerous body of the population of both the Persian and th Roman empires which was opposed to the state religion, ar which was continually exposed to persecution by these tw bigoted governments. In Persia, Chosroes persecuted th orthodox Christians with as much cruelty as Heraclius to mented the Jews and heretics within the bounds of th empire.[2] The ability with which Mahomet put forward h creed removed it entirely from the schools of theology, an secured among the people a secret feeling in favour of i justice, particularly when its votaries appeared as offering refuge to the oppressed, and a protection against religiou persecution.

As this work only proposes to notice the influence Mohammedanism on the fortunes and condition of the Gre nation, it is not necessary to narrate in detail the progress the Arab conquests in the Roman empire. The first hostilitie between the followers of Mahomet and the Roman troop occurred while Heraclius was at Jerusalem, engaged in cel brating the restoration of the holy cross, bearing it on h own shoulders up Mount Calvary, and persecuting the Jews b driving them out of their native city.[3] In his desire to obta the favour of Heaven by purifying the Holy City, he ove looked the danger which his authority might incur from th hatred and despair of his persecuted subjects. The fir military operations of the Arabs excited little alarm in th minds of the emperor and his officers in Syria; the Roma forces had always been accustomed to repel the incursions the Saracens with ease; the irregular cavalry of the dese though often successful in plundering incursions, had hithert

1 Ockley's *Hist. of the Saracens*, i. 197.

2 Theophanes, *Chron.* 252. Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.* pp. 12, 14.

3 The holy cross was replaced in the Church of the Resurrection on the 14th Septe ber, 629. In the month of Djoumadi I., in the eighth year of the Hegira (Septembe 629), war broke out between the Christian subjects of the empire and the Saracen followers of Mahomet.

proved ineffective against the regularly disciplined and completely armed troops of the empire. But a new spirit was now infused into the Arabian armies; and the implicit obedience which the troops of the Prophet paid to his commands, rendered their discipline as superior to that of the imperial forces, as their tactics and their arms were inferior.

Mahomet did not live to profit by the experience which his followers gained in their first struggle with the Romans. A long series of wars in Arabia ended in the destruction of many rival prophets, and at last united the Arabs into one great nation under the spiritual rule of Mahomet. But Aboubekr, who succeeded to his power as chief of the true believers, was compelled, during the first year of his government, to renew the contest, in consequence of fresh rebellions and insurrections of false prophets, who expected to profit by the death of Mahomet. When tranquillity was established in Arabia, Aboubekr commenced those wars for the propagation of Mohammedanism which destroyed the Persian empire of the Sassanides, and extinguished the power of Rome in the East. The Christian Arabs who owned allegiance to Heraclius were first attacked in order to complete the unity of Arabia, by forcing them to embrace the religion of Mahomet. In the year 633 the Mohammedans invaded Syria, where their progress was rapid, although Heraclius himself was in the neighbourhood, for he generally resided at Emesa or Antioch, in order to devote his constant attention to restoring Syria to a state of order and obedience. The imperial troops made considerable efforts to support the military renown of the Roman armies, but were almost universally unsuccessful. The emperor did not neglect his duty; he assembled all the troops that he could collect, and intrusted the command of the army to his brother Theodore, who had distinguished himself in the Persian wars by gaining an important victory in very critical circumstances.[1] Vartan, who commanded after Theodore, had also distinguished himself in the last glorious campaign in Persia.[2] Unfortunately the health of Heraclius prevented his taking the field in person.[3] The absence of all moral checks in the Roman administration, and the total want of patriotism in the officers and troops at this period, rendered the personal influence of the emperor necessary at the head of his armies, in order to preserve due

[1] Theophanes, *Chron.* 263. [2] Ibid. 265. Either in the year 634 or 636.
[3] Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus, p. 17. Ockley, *Hist. Sarac.* i. 271.

subordination, and enforce union among the leading men in the empire, as each individual was always more occupied in intriguing to gain some advantage over his colleagues than in striving to advance the service of the State. The ready obedience and devoted patriotism of the Saracens formed a sad contrast to the insubordination and treachery of the Romans, and would fully explain the success of the Mohammedan arms, without the assistance of any very extraordinary impulse of religious zeal, with which, however, there can be no doubt the Arabs were deeply imbued. The easy conquest of Syria by the Arabs is by no means so wonderful as the facility with which they governed it when conquered, and the tranquillity of the population under their government.

Towards the end of the year 633, the troops of Aboubekr laid siege to Bostra, a strong frontier town of Syria, which was surrendered early in the following year by the treachery of its governor.[1] During the campaign of 634 the Roman armies were defeated at Adjnadin, in the south of Palestine, and at a bloody and decisive battle on the banks of the river Yermouk in which it is said that the imperial troops were commanded by the emperor's brother Theodore. Theodore was replaced by Vartan, but the rebellion of Vartan's army and another defeat terminated this general's career.[2] In the third year of the war the Saracens gained possession of Damascus by capitulation, and they guaranteed to the inhabitants the full exercise of their municipal privileges, allowed them to use their local mint, and left the orthodox in possession of the great church of St. John. About the same time, Heraclius quitted Edessa and returned to Constantinople, carrying with him the holy cross which he had recovered from the Persians and deposited at Jerusalem with great solemnity only six years before, but which he now considered it necessary to remove into Europe for greater safety. His son, Heraclius Constantine, who had received the imperial title when an infant, remained in Syria to supply his place and direct the military operations for the defence of the province.[3] The events of

[1] For the chronology of the Syrian war, see the table at the commencement of the volume. I have followed Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*. But the confusion is often so great as to defy all explanation.

[2] Ockley (i. 70) names this general Werdan, and says he was slain at the battle of Adjnadin. Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 280) calls him Vahan (Βαανης), and mentions the rebellion of his army. Eutychius (ii. 276) says he retired from the field of battle, and became a monk at Mount Sinai.

[3] Theophanes, *Chron.* 280. Ockley's Arabian authorities confounded the young Heraclius with his father.—See p. 271, where the father is spoken of when he could not be in Syria, and the son is mentioned at p. 282. I follow Theophanes as the best authority in what relates to Heraclius.

this campaign illustrate the feelings of the Syrian population. The Arabs plundered a great fair at the monastery of Abilkodos, about thirty miles from Damascus; and the Syrian towns, alarmed for their wealth, and indifferent to the cause of their rulers, began to negotiate separate truces with the Arabs. Indeed, wherever the imperial garrison was not sufficient to overawe the inhabitants, the native Syrians sought to make any arrangement with the Arabs which would insure their towns from plunder, feeling satisfied that the Arab authorities could not use their power with greater rapacity and cruelty than the imperial officers. The garrison of Emesa defended itself for a year in the vain hope of being relieved by the Roman army, and they obtained favourable terms from the Saracens, even after this long defence. Arethusa (Restan), Epiphanea (Hama), Larissa (Schizar), and Heliopolis (Baalbec), all entered into treaties, which led to their becoming tributary to the Saracen. Chalcis (Kinesrin) alone was plundered as a punishment for its tardy submission, or for some violation of a truce. No general arrangements, either for defence or submission, were adopted by the Christians, whose ideas of political union had been utterly extinguished by the Roman power, and who were now satisfied if they could preserve their lives and properties, without seeking any guarantee for the future. The Romans still retained some hope of reconquering Syria, until the loss of another decisive battle in the year 636 compelled them to abandon the province.[1] In the following year, A.D. 637, the Arabs advanced to Jerusalem, and the surrender of the holy city was marked by arrangements between the patriarch Sophronius and the caliph Omar, who repaired in person to Palestine to take possession of so distinguished a conquest.[2] The conditions of the capitulation indicate that the Christian patriarch looked

[1] Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 280) appears to place the battle of Yermouk in this year, and speaks of Vahan defeated at Yermouk, as the same person who commanded in the second campaign, and whom the Arabian historian distinguishes. This Vahan is called Mahan by Ockley (i. 20), who follows the authority of Theophanes for the date of the battle of Yermouk. Theophanes, however, indicates that the battle of Yermouk followed immediately after the death of Aboubekr, and appears to have confused the two great battles which decided the fate of Syria. Ockley's conjecture that Manuel was meant has been copied in the *Universal History*, and by Lebeau. Both Vartan and Vahan are Armenian names. Manuel, who subsequently commanded in Egypt, was also an Armenian. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xi.—Notes de Saint Martin.

[2] During the middle ages the Christians forged a document purporting to be a charter of protection to the inhabitants of Jerusalem by the prophet Mahomet himself, dated in the fourth year of the Hegira, but it is doubtful whether this forgery is as old as the first crusade. A Latin text is given in *Negociations de la France dans le Levant*, i. xvi.

rather to the protection of his own bishopric than to his duty to his country and his sovereign. The facility with which the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, at this time, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Gennaddius, at the time of the conquest of the Byzantine empire by Mohammed II. (A.D. 1453), became the ministers of their Mohammedan conquerors, showed the slight hold which national feelings retained over the minds of the orthodox Greek clergy.[1] It appears strange that Sophronius, who was the head of a Greek and Melchite congregation, living in the midst of a numerous and hostile Jacobite population, should have so readily consented to abandon his connection with the Greek empire and the orthodox church when both religion and policy seemed so strongly to demand greater firmness; and on this very account, his conduct must be admitted to afford evidence of the humanity and good faith with which the early Mohammedans fulfilled their promises.[2] The state of society in the Roman provinces rendered it impossible to replace the great losses which the armies had suffered in the Syrian campaigns; and the financial resources of the empire forbade any attempt to raise a mercenary force among the northern nations sufficiently powerful to meet the Saracens in the field. Yet the exertions of Heraclius were so great that he concentrated an army at Amida (Diarbekr) in the year 638, which made a bold attempt to regain possession of the north of Syria. Emesa was besieged; but the Saracens soon assembled an overwhelming force; the Romans were defeated, the conquest of Syria was completed, and Mesopotamia was invaded.[3] The subjection of Syria and Palestine was not effected by the Saracens until they laboured through five vigorous campaigns, and fought several bloody battles. The contest affords conclusive testimony that the reforms of Heraclius had already restored the discipline and courage of the Roman armies; but, at the same time, the indifference of the native population to the result of the wars testifies with equal certainty that he had made comparatively small progress in his civil and financial improvements.[4]

The Arab conquest not only put an end to the political

[1] The Greek patriarchs of this age did little honour to their religion. Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, when banished after the death of Heraclius, renounced his Monothelite opinions in orthodox Africa, and made a public abjuration of them at Rome before Pope Theodore. Yet when he visited Ravenna, he as publicly returned to his Monothelite belief.

[2] The violence with which Sophronius had opposed the opinions of the Monothelites, may have induced him to confound treason with orthodoxy.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. 65.

[3] Weil, i. 81.

[4] Theophanes, 282.

power of the Romans, which had lasted seven hundred years, but it also soon rooted out every trace of the Greek civilisation introduced by the conquests of Alexander the Great, and which had flourished in the country for upwards of nine centuries.[1] A considerable number of native Syrians endeavoured to preserve their independence, and retreated into the fastnesses of Mount Lebanon, where they continued to defend themselves. Under the name of Mardaïtes, they soon became formidable to the Mohammedans, and for some time checked the power of the caliphs in Syria, and by the diversions which they made whenever the arms of the Arabs were employed in Asia Minor, they contributed to arrest their progress.[2] The year after Syria was subdued, Mesopotamia was invaded, and proved an easy conquest; as its imperial governors, and the inhabitants of its cities, showed the same readiness to enter into treaties with the Mohammedans.[3]

As soon as the Arabs had completed the conquest of Syria, they invaded Egypt. The national and religious hostility which prevailed between the native population and the Greek colonists, insured the Mohammedans a welcome from the Egyptians; but at the same time, this very circumstance excited the Greeks to make the most determined resistance. The patriarch Cyrus had adopted the Monothelite opinions of his sovereign, and this rendered his position uneasy amidst the orthodox Greeks of Alexandria. Anxious to avert any disturbance in the province, he conceived the idea of purchasing peace for Egypt from the Saracens, by paying them an annual tribute; and he entered into negotiations for this purpose, in which Mokaukas, who remained at the head of the fiscal department, joined him. The emperor Heraclius, informed of this intrigue, sent an Armenian governor, Manuel, with a body of troops, to defend the province, and ordered the negotiations to be broken off. The fortune of the Arabs again prevailed, and the Roman army was defeated. Amrou, the Saracen general, having taken Pelusium, laid siege to Misr, or Babylon, the chief native city of Egypt, and the seat of the provincial administration. The treachery or patriotism of Mokaukas, for his position warrants either supposition,

1 Pompey expelled Antiochus, B.C. 65. Alexander the Great conquered Syria, B.C. 331.

2 The Mardaïtes are supposed by some to be the ancestors of the Maronites.—Theophanes, *Chron.* 295, 300. Asseman. *Biblioth. Orient. Vat.* tom. i. 496.

3 Theophanes, *Chron.* 202. The governors of Osrhoene and Edessa both proved traitors.

induced him to join the Arabs, and assist them in capturing the town.[1] A capitulation was concluded, by which the native Egyptians retained possession of all their property, and enjoyed the free exercise of their religion as Jacobites, on paying a tribute of two pieces of gold for every male inhabitant. If the accounts of historians can be relied on, it would seem that the population of Egypt had suffered less from the vicious administration of the Roman empire, and from the Persian invasion, than any other part of their dominions; for about the time of its conquest by the Romans it contained seven millions and a half, exclusive of Alexandria, and its population was now estimated at six millions.[2] This account is by no means impossible, for the most active cause of the depopulation of the Roman empire arose from the neglect of all those accessories of civilisation which facilitate the distribution and circulation as well as the production of the necessaries of life.[3] From neglect of this kind Egypt had suffered comparatively little, as the natural advantages of the soil, and the physical conformation of the country, intersected by one mighty river, had compensated for the supineness of its rulers. The Nile was the great road of the province, and nature kept it constantly available for transport at the cheapest rate, for the current enabled the heaviest laden boats, and even the rudest rafts, to descend the river with their cargoes rapidly and securely; while the north wind, blowing steadily for almost nine months in the year, enabled every boat that could hoist a sail to stem the current, and reach the limits of the province with as much certainty, if not with such rapidity, as a modern steam-boat. And when the waters of the Nile were separated over the Delta, they became a valuable property to corporations and individuals, whose rights the Roman law respected, and whose interests and wealth were sufficient to keep in repair the canals of irrigation; so that the vested capital of Egypt suffered little diminution, while war and oppression annihilated the ac-

[1] Ockley calls Mokaukas the prefect of Heraclius, of the sect of the Jacobites, and a mortal enemy of the Greeks. Eutychius (ii. 302) is his authority.

[2] Josephus, B. J. ii. 16; vol. v. 206 (Whiston's translation). Eutychius (ii. 311) says that those registered for the tribute amounted to 6,000,000. He seems to confound this with the whole number of the native population.

[3] Strabo says the revenue of Egypt under Ptolemy Auletes was about two and a half millions sterling, and double under the Romans. In 1566, it yielded the Turks only £150,000.—Dr. Vincent, ii. 69. Reference has been made at page 351 to the edict which prohibited the exportation of grain from every port in Egypt except Alexandria; and the exportation from Alexandria had diminished even in the time of Justinian.

cumulations of ages over the rest of the world. The immense wealth and importance of Alexandria, the only port which Egypt possessed for communicating with the empire, still made it one of the first cities in the world for riches and population, though its strength had received a severe blow by the Persian conquest.[1]

The canal which connected the Nile with the Red Sea furnished the means of transporting the agricultural produce of the rich valley of Egypt to the arid coast of Arabia, and created and nourished a trade which added considerably to the wealth and population of both countries.[2] This canal, in its most improved state, commenced at Babylon, and ended at Arsinoe (Suez). It fertilised a large district on its banks, which has again relapsed into the same condition as the rest of the desert, and it created an oasis of verdure on the shore of the Red Sea. Arsinoe flourished amidst groves of palm-trees and sycamores, with a branch of the Nile flowing beneath its walls, where Suez now withers in a dreary waste, destitute alike of vegetables and of potable water, which are transported from Cairo for the use of the travellers who arrive from India. This canal was anciently used for the transport of large and bulky commodities, for which land carriage would have proved either impracticable or too expensive. By means of it, Trajan transported, from the quarries on the Red Sea to the shores of the Mediterranean, many of the columns and vases of granite and porphyry with which he adorned Rome.[3] This canal may have been neglected during the troubles in the reigns of Phocas and Heraclius, while the Persians occupied the country; but it was in such a state of preservation as to require but slight repairs from the earlier caliphs.[4] A year after Amrou had completed the conquest of Egypt, he had established the water communication between the Nile and the Red Sea; and, by sending large supplies of grain by the canal to Suez, he was able to relieve the inhabitants of Mecca, who were suffering from famine. After more than one interruption from neglect, the policy of the caliphs of

[1] The emperor Hadrian was struck by the commercial activity of Alexandria: "Civitas in qua nemo vivat otiosus."—*Hist. Aug. Scrip.* 245.

[2] Herodotus, Diodorus, and Strabo, saw this canal in operation.—Herod. ii. 158. Diod. i. 33, 83. Strabo, i, 17. See also Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vi. 29. Plutarch's *Life of Antony*, sect. 82. Lucian, *Pseudomant*, sect. 44.

[3] Strabo, xvii. 788, 804. Ptol. *Geog.* iv. 5, p. 108. It was called, after Trajan's repairs, Τραϊανὸς ποταμός.

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. c. 8. Paul. Silent. *Disc. Sanctæ Sophiæ*, i. v. 379, 625.

Bagdat allowed it to fall into decay, and it was filled up b
Al Manzor, A.D. 762–767.[1]

As soon as the Arabs had settled the affairs of the nativ
population, they laid siege to Alexandria. This city made
vigorous defence, and Heraclius exerted himself to succour it
but, though it held out for several months, it was at last take
by the Arabs, for the troubles which occurred at Constantinop
after the death of Heraclius prevented the Roman governmen
from sending reinforcements to the garrison. The confidenc
of the Saracens induced them to leave a feeble corps for it
defence after they had taken it; and the Roman troops, watch
ing an opportunity for renewing the war, recovered the city, an
massacred the Mohammedans, but were soon compelled t
retire to their ships, and make their escape. The conque
of Alexandria is said to have cost the Arabs twenty-thre
thousand men; and they are accused of using their victory lik
rude barbarians, because they destroyed the libraries and worl
of art of the Greeks, though a Mohammedan historian migh
appeal to the permanence of their power, and the increase i
the numbers of the votaries of the Prophet, as a proof of th
profound policy and statesman-like views of the men wh
rooted out every trace of an adverse civilisation, and of
hostile race. The professed object of the Saracens was to re
place Greek domination by Mohammedan toleration. Polit
cal sagacity at the same time convinced the Arabs that it wa
necessary to exterminate Greek civilisation in order to destro
Greek influence. The Goths, who sought only to plunder th
Roman empire, might spare the libraries of the Greeks, bu
the Mohammedans, whose object was to convert or to subdu
considered it a duty to root out everything that presented an
obstacle to the ultimate success of their schemes for the adve
of Mohammedan civilisation.[2] In less than five years (A.
646), a Roman army, sent by the emperor Constans under th
command of Manuel, again recovered possession of Alexandri
by the assistance of the Greek inhabitants who had remaine
in the place; but the Mohammedans soon appeared befo
the city, and, with the assistance of the Egyptians, compelle
the imperial troops to abandon their conquest.[3] The walls
Alexandria were thrown down, the Greek population driven ou

[1] Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xi. 300,—Notes de S. M. *Notices des Manuscrits Arabes*, par Langles, tom. vi. 334.

[2] Gibbon, in his account of the destruction of the great Alexandrian library, deplo
ciates the injury which literature sustained.—Ch. li.

[3] Eutychius, 2, 339. Ockley, i. 325.

and the commercial importance of the city destroyed. Thus perished one of the most remarkable colonies of the Greek nation, and one of the most renowned seats of that Greek civilisation of which Alexander the Great had laid the foundations in the East, after having flourished in the highest degree of prosperity for nearly a thousand years.[1]

The conquest of Cyrenaïca followed the subjugation of Egypt as an immediate consequence. The Greeks are said to have planted their first colonies in this country six hundred and thirty-one years before the Christian era,[2] and twelve centuries of uninterrupted possession appeared to have constituted them the perpetual tenants of the soil; but the Arabs were very different masters from the Romans, and under their domination the Greek race soon became extinct in Africa. It is not necessary here to follow the Saracens in their farther conquests westward. The dominant people with whom they had to contend was Latin, and not Greek, in the western provinces; the ruling classes were attached to the Roman government, though often disgusted by the tyranny of the emperors; and consequently they defended themselves with far more courage and obstinacy than the Syrians and Egyptians. The war was marked by considerable vicissitudes, and it was not till the year 698 that Carthage fell permanently into the hands of the Saracens, who, according to their usual policy, threw down the walls and ruined the public buildings, in order to destroy every political trace of Roman government in Africa. The Saracens were singularly successful in all their projects of destruction; in a short time both Latin and Greek civilisation was exterminated on the southern shores of the Mediterranean.

It may be observed that the success of the Mohammedan religion, under the earlier caliphs, did not keep pace with the progress of the Arab arms. Of all the native population of the countries subdued, the Arabs of Syria alone appear to have immediately adopted the new religion of their co-national race; but the great mass of the Christians in Syria, Mesopo-

[1] Alexandria was founded B.C. 332. After the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens, the Egyptian or Coptic language began to give way to the Arabic. This followed because the numbers of the Copts were gradually reduced by the oppressive government of their new masters, until they formed a minority of the population. Amrou, the conqueror of Egypt, who governed it several years, is said to have left at his death a sum equal to eight millions sterling, accumulated by his extortions. The caliph Othman is said to have left only seven millions in the Arabian treasury at his death. The officers soon became richer than the State.

[2] Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, i. 204.

tamia, Egypt, Cyrenaïca, and Africa, clung firmly to thei faith, and the decline of Christianity in all these countries i to be attributed rather to the extermination than to the con version of the Christian inhabitants. The decrease in th number of the Christians was invariably attended by decrease in the numbers of the inhabitants, and arose evidentl from the oppressive treatment which they suffered under th Mohammedan rulers of these countries,—a system of tyranni which was at last carried so far as to reduce whole province to unpeopled deserts, ready to receive an Arab population almost in a nomade state, as the successors of the exterminate Christians. It was only when Mohammedanism presented it system of unity, in opposition to the evident falsity of idolatry or to the unintelligible discussions of an incomprehensibl theology, that the human mind was easily led away by it religious doctrines, which addressed the passions of mankin rather too palpably to be secure of commanding their reason The earliest Mohammedan conversions of foreign races wer made among the subjects of Persia, who mingled native o provincial superstitions with the Magian faith, and among th Christians of Nubia and the interior of Africa, whose religio may have departed very far from the pure doctrines o Christianity. The success of the Mohammedans was generall confined to barbarous and ignorant converts; and the mor civilised people retained their faith as long as they coul secure their national existence. This fact deserves to be car fully contrasted with the progress of Christianity, which usuall indicated an immediate advance in the scale of civilisatio Yet the peculiar causes which enabled the Christians of th seventh and eighth centuries, in the ignorant and debase mental condition into which they had fallen, to resist steadi the attacks of Mohammedanism, and to prefer extinction t apostasy, deserve a more accurate investigation than the have yet met with from historians.

The construction of the political government of the Saracen empire was far more imperfect than the creed of the Mo hammedans, and shows that Mahomet had neither conten plated extensive foreign conquests, nor devoted the energies o his powerful mind to the consideration of the questions o administration which would arise out of the difficult tas of ruling a numerous and wealthy population possessed o property but deprived of civil rights. No attempt was mad to arrange any systematic form of political government, an

the whole power of the State was vested in the hands of the chief priest of the religion, who was only answerable for the due exercise of this extraordinary power to God, his own conscience, and his subjects' patience. The moment, therefore, that the responsibility created by national feelings, military companionship, and exalted enthusiasm, ceased to operate on the minds of the caliphs, the administration became far more oppressive than that of the Roman empire. No local magistrates elected by the people, and no parish priests, connected by their feelings and interests both with their superiors and inferiors, bound society together by common ties; and no system of legal administration, independent of the military and financial authorities, preserved the property of the people from the rapacity of the government. Socially and politically the Saracen empire was little better than the Gothic, Hunnish, and Avar monarchies; and that it proved more durable, with almost equal oppression, is to be attributed to the powerful enthusiasm of Mahomet's religion, which tempered for some time its avarice and tyranny.

Even the military successes of the Arabs are to be ascribed in some measure to accidental causes, over which they themselves exercised no control. The number of disciplined and veteran troops who had served in the Roman and Persian armies could not have been matched by the Arabian armies. But no inconsiderable part of the followers of Mahomet had been trained in the Persian war, and the religious zeal of neophytes, who regarded war as a sacred duty, enabled the youngest recruits to perform the service of veterans. The enthusiasm was more powerful than the courage of the Roman troops, and their strict obedience to their leaders compensated in a great degree for their inferiority in arms and tactics.[1] But a long war proved that the military qualities of the Roman armies were more lasting than those of the Arabs. The important and rapid conquests of the Mohammedans were assisted by the religious dissensions and national antipathies which placed the great bulk of the people of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, in hostility to the Roman government, and neutralised many of the advantages which they might have derived from their military skill and discipline amidst a

[1] Ockley's *Hist. of the Saracens*, i. 85. The Greeks (Roman troops) were completely armed; the Arabs were almost without defensive armour until they had obtained the arms of the Greeks by conquest. The statements in Ockley's History must be received with caution. His principal authority, Al Wakidi, indulges in romantic colouring, and is careless of facts and dates.—Weil, i. 48, note 1.

favourable population. The Roman government had to en
counter the excited energies of the Arabs, at a moment, too
when its resources were exhausted, and its strength wa
weakened by a long war with Persia, which had for severa
years totally destroyed the influence of the central executiv
administration, and enabled numerous chiefs to acquire a
almost independent authority. These chiefs were generall
destitute of every feeling of patriotism; nor can this excite ou
wonder, for the feeling of patriotism was then an unknow
sentiment in every rank of society throughout the Easter
Empire; their conduct was entirely directed by ambition an
interest, and they sought only to secure themselves in th
possession of the districts which they governed. The exampl
of Mokaukas in Egypt, and of Youkinna at Aleppo, are re
markable instances of the power and treasonable dispositio
of many of these imperial officers. But almost every governo
in Syria displayed equal faithlessness.[1] Yet in spite of th
treason of some officers, and the submission of others, th
defence of Syria does not appear to have been on the whol
disgraceful to the Roman army, and the Arabs purchased the
conquest by severe fighting, and at the cost of much blood
An anecdote mentioned in the "History of the Saracens,"
shows that the importance of order and discipline was no
overlooked by Khaled, the Sword of God, as he was styled b
his admiring countrymen; and that his great success wa
owing to military skill, as well as religious enthusiasm an
fiery valour. "Mead," says the historian, "encouraged th
Saracens with the hopes of Paradise, and the enjoyment o
everlasting life, if they fought for the cause of God an
religion. 'Softly,' said Khaled; 'let me get them into goo
order before you set them upon fighting.'"[3] Under all th
disadvantages mentioned, it is not surprising that the hostil
feelings of a numerous, wealthy, and heretical portion of th
Syrian community, engaged in trade, and willing to purchas
peace and toleration at any reasonable sacrifice, should hav
turned the scale against the Romans. The struggle becam
doubtful from the moment that the people of Damascus con
cluded an advantageous truce with the Arabs. Emesa an
other cities could then venture to follow the example, merel

[1] Mansour, the governor of Damascus.—Eutychius, ii. 281. Bostra, Emess
Kinnisrin, and Aleppo.—Ockley, i. 156–162. The citizens of Baalbec.—Ockley, i. 17
[2] Ockley, i. 70.
[3] A similar anecdote is told of Cromwell, who once addressed his troops, "Put you
trust in the Lord, and keep your powder dry."

for the purpose of securing their own property, without any reference to the general interests of the province, or the military plans of defence of the Roman government. Yet one of the chiefs, who held a portion of the coast of Phœnicia, succeeded in maintaining his independence against the whole power of the Saracens, and formed in the mountains of Lebanon a small Christian principality, of which the town of Byblos (Djebail) was the capital. Round this nucleus the Mardaïtes, or native Syrians, appear to have rallied in considerable force.

The great influence exercised by the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria in their provinces, tended also to weaken and distract the measures adopted for the defence of these countries. Their willingness to negotiate with the Arabs, who were resolved only to be satisfied with conquest, placed the Roman armies and government in a disadvantageous position. Where the chances of war are nearly balanced, the good will of the people will eventually decide the contest in favour of the party that they espouse. Now there is strong reason to believe, that even a majority of the orthodox subjects of the Roman Empire, in the provinces which were conquered during the reign of Heraclius, were the well-wishers of the Arabs; that they regarded the emperor with aversion as a heretic; and that they fancied they were sufficiently guaranteed against the oppression of their new masters, by the rigid observance of justice which characterised all their earlier acts. A temporary diminution of tribute, or escape from some oppressive act of administration, induced them to compromise their religious position and their national independence. The fault is too natural a one to be severely blamed. They feared that Heraclius might commence a persecution in order to enforce conformity with his monothelite opinions, for of religious liberty the age had no just conception; and the Syrians and Egyptians had been slaves for far too many centuries to be impressed with any idea of the sacrifices which a nation ought to make in order to secure its independence. The moral tone adopted by the caliph Aboubekr, in his instructions to the Syrian army, was also so unlike the principles of the Roman government, that it must have commanded profound attention from a subject people. "Be just," said the proclamation of Aboubekr, "the unjust never prosper; be valiant, die rather than yield; be merciful, slay neither old men, children, nor women. Destroy neither fruit-

trees, grain, nor cattle; keep your word, even to your enemies; molest not those men who live retired from the world, but compel the rest of mankind to become Mussulmans, or to pay us tribute,—if they refuse these terms, slay them." Such a proclamation announced to Jews and Christians sentiments of justice and principles of toleration which neither Roman emperors nor orthodox bishops had ever adopted as the rule of their conduct. This remarkable document must have made a deep impression on the minds of an oppressed and persecuted people. Its effect was soon increased by the wonderful spectacle of the caliph Omar riding into Jerusalem on the camel which carried all the baggage and provisions which he required for his journey from Mecca. The contrast thus offered between the rude simplicity of a great conqueror and the extravagant pomp of the provincial representatives of a defeated emperor must have embittered the hatred already strong in an oppressed people against a rapacious government. Had the Saracens been able to unite a system of judicial legislation and administration, and of elective local and municipal governments for their conquered subjects, with the vigour of their own central power and the religious monarchy of their own national government, it is difficult to conceive that any limits could ultimately have been opposed to their authority by the then existing states into which the world was divided.[1]

But the political system of the Saracens was of itself utterly barbarous, and it only caught a passing gleam of justice, while worldly prudence tempered the religious feelings of their prophet's doctrines. A remarkable feature of the policy by which they maintained their power over the provinces which they conquered, ought not to be overlooked, as it illustrates both their confidence in their military superiority and the low state of their social civilisation. They generally destroyed the walls of the cities which they subdued, whenever the fortifications offered peculiar facilities for defence, or contained a native population active and bold enough to threaten danger

[1] It is not correct to reproach the early Mohammedans with fanaticism. Even the fire-worshippers of Persia, who were idolaters in the eyes of the Saracens, and did not worship the true God, were, by their principles of toleration, allowed the exercise of their religion on paying tribute, a fact proved by several passages in the Arabian historians. The instructions of the Othoman Sultan Suleiman in the Maltekas, display the increase of bigotry in modern times. If the infidel refuse to embrace Islam, or to pay the capitation-tax, his land is to be rendered desolate with fire, his trees are to be cut down, his cornfields laid waste, and he is to be slain or enslaved.—Hammer, *Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung des osmanischen Reichs*, i. 163.

from rebellion. Many celebrated Roman cities were destroyed, and the Saracen administration was transferred to new capitals, founded where a convenient military station for overawing the country could be safely established. Thus Alexandria, Babylon or Misr, Carthage, Ctesiphon, and Babylon, were destroyed, and Fostat, Kairowan, Cufa, Bussora, and Bagdat, rose to supplant them.

Section III

CONSTANS II., A.D. 641–668

After the death of Heraclius, the short reigns of his sons, Constantine III., or Heraclius Constantine, and Heracleonas, were disturbed by court intrigues and the disorders which naturally result from the want of a settled law of succession. In such conjunctures, the people and the courtiers learn alike to traffic in sedition. Before the termination of the year in which Heraclius died, his grandson, Constans II., mounted the imperial throne at the age of eleven, in consequence of the death of his father Constantine, and the dethronement of his uncle Heracleonas. An oration made by the young prince to the senate after his accession, in which he invoked the aid of that body, and spoke of their power in terms of reverence, warrants the conclusion that the aristocracy had again recovered its influence over the imperial administration; and that, though the emperor's authority was still held to be absolute by the constitution of the empire, it was really controlled by the influence of the persons holding ministerial offices.[1]

Constans grew up to be a man of considerable abilities and of an energetic character, but possessed of violent passions, and destitute of all the amiable feelings of humanity. The early part of his reign, during which the imperial ministers were controlled by the selfish aristocracy, was marked by the loss of several portions of the empire. The Lombards extended their conquests in Italy from the maritime Alps to the frontiers of Tuscany; and the exarch of Ravenna was defeated with considerable loss near Modenna; but still they were unable to make any serious impression on the exarchate. Armenia was compelled to pay tribute to the Saracens. Cyprus was rendered tributary to the caliph, though the amount of the tribute imposed was only seven thousand two hundred

[1] Theophanes, *Chron.* 284.

pieces of gold—half of what it had previously paid to the emperor. This trifling sum can have hardly amounted to the moiety of the surplus usually paid into the imperial treasury after all the expenses of the local government were defrayed, and cannot have borne any relation to the amount of taxation levied by the Roman emperors in the island. It contrasts strangely with the large payments made by single cities for a year's truce in Syria, and the immense wealth collected by the Arabs in Syria, Egypt, Persia, and Africa.[1] The commercial town of Aradus, in Syria, had hitherto resisted the Saracens from the strength of its insular position. It was now taken and destroyed. In a subsequent expedition, Cos was taken by the treachery of its bishop, and the city plundered and laid waste. Rhodes was then attacked and captured. This last conquest is memorable for the destruction of the celebrated Colossus, which, though it fell about fifty-six years after its erection, had been always, even in its prostrate condition, regarded as one of the wonders of the world. The admiration of the Greeks and Romans had protected it from destruction for nine centuries. The Arabs, to whom works of art possessed no value, broke it in pieces, and sold the bronze of which it was composed. The metal is said to have loaded nine hundred and eighty camels.

As soon as Constans was old enough to assume the direction of public business, the two great objects of his policy were the establishment of the absolute power of the emperor over the orthodox church, and the recovery of the lost provinces of the empire. With the view of obtaining and securing a perfect control over the ecclesiastical affairs of his dominions, he published an edict, called the Type, in the year 648, when he was only eighteen years old.[2] It was prepared by Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople, and was intended to terminate the disputes produced by the Ecthesis of Heraclius. All parties were commanded by the Type to observe a profound silence on the previous quarrels concerning the operation of the will in Christ. Liberty of conscience was an idea almost unknown to any but the Mohammedans, so that Constans

[1] The governor of Jushiyah paid 4000 pieces of gold, and fifty pieces of silk, for a year's truce.—Ockley, i. 150. Hems paid 10,000 pieces of gold, and 200 pieces of silk.—P. 154. Baalbec, 2000 ounces of gold, 4000 of silver, and 2000 pieces of silk.—P. 177. Kinnisrin and Alhadir, 5000 ounces of gold, as many of silver, and 2000 vests of silk.—P. 233. The tribute of Egypt was two pieces of gold a head. Eutychius, ii. 308. The accounts of the wealth of Ctesiphon are almost incredible, and those of Sufetula in Byzacene completely so.—Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. xi. 313, 329.

[2] The Type is contained in Hardouin's *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 824.

never thought of appealing to any such right; and no party in the Christian church was inclined to waive its orthodox authority of enforcing its own opinions upon others. The Latin church, led by the Bishop of Rome, was always ready to oppose the Greek clergy, who enjoyed the favour of the imperial court, and this jealousy engaged the pope in violent opposition to the Type. But the bishop of Rome was not then so powerful as the popes became at a subsequent period, so that he durst not attempt directly to question the authority of the emperor in regulating such matters. Perhaps it appeared to him hardly prudent to rouse the passions of a young prince of eighteen, who might prove not very bigoted in his attachment to any party, as, indeed, the provisions of the Type seemed to indicate. The pope Theodore, therefore, directed the whole of his ecclesiastical fury against the patriarch of Constantinople, whom he excommunicated with circumstances of singular and impressive violence. He descended with his clergy into the dark tomb of Saint Peter in the Vatican, now under the centre of the dome in the vault of the great Cathedral of Christendom, consecrated the sacred cup, and, having dipped his pen in the blood of Christ, signed an act of excommunication, condemning a brother bishop to the pains of hell. To this indecent proceeding Paul the Patriarch replied by persuading the emperor to persecute the clergy who adhered to the pope's opinion, in a more regular and legal manner, by depriving them of their temporalities, and condemning them to banishment. The pope was supported by nearly the whole body of the Latin clergy, and even by a considerable party in the East; yet, when Martin, the successor of Theodore, ventured to anathematise the Ecthesis and the Type, he was seized by order of Constans, conveyed to Constantinople, tried, and condemned on a charge of having supported the rebellion of the exarch Olympius, and of having remitted money to the Saracens. The emperor, at the intercession of the patriarch Paul, commuted his punishment to exile, and the pope died in banishment at Cherson in Tauris. Though Constans did not succeed in inculcating his doctrines on the clergy, he completely succeeded in enforcing public obedience to his decrees in the church, and the fullest acknowledgment of his supreme power over the persons of the clergy. These disputes between the heads of the ecclesiastical administration of the Greek and Latin churches afforded an excellent pretext for extending the breach, which had its real

origin in national feelings and clerical interests, and was on widened by the difficult and not very intelligible distinctions monothelitism. Constans himself, by his vigour and person activity in this struggle, incurred the bitter hatred of a larg portion of the clergy, and his conduct has been unquestionab the object of much misrepresentation and calumny.

The attention of Constans to ecclesiastical affairs induce him to visit Armenia, where his attempts to unite the peop to his government by regulating the affairs of their churc were as unsuccessful as his religious interference elsewher Dissensions were increased; one of the imperial officers high rank rebelled; and the Saracens availed themselves this state of things to invade both Armenia and Cappadoci and succeeded in rendering several districts tributary. Th increasing power of Moawyah, the Arab general, induced hi to form a project for the conquest of Constantinople, and H began to fit out a great naval expedition at Tripoli in Syri A daring enterprise of two brothers, Christian inhabitants the place, rendered the expedition abortive. These tw Tripolitans and their partisans broke open the prisons in whic the Roman captives were confined, and, placing themselves a the head of an armed band which they had hastily forme seized the city, slew the governor, and burnt the fleet. second armament was at length prepared by the energy Moawyah, and as it was reported to be directed against Co stantinople, the emperor Constans took upon himself th command of his own fleet. He met the Saracen expeditio off Mount Phœnix in Lycia, and attacked it with great vigou Twenty thousand Romans are said to have perished in th battle;[1] and the emperor himself owed his safety to the valou of one of the Tripolitan brothers, whose gallant defence of th imperial galley enabled the emperor to escape before its valia defender was slain, and the vessel fell into the hands of th Saracens. The emperor retired to Constantinople, but th hostile fleet had suffered too much to attempt any farthe operations, and the expedition was abandoned for that yea The death of Othman, and the pretensions of Moawyah t the caliphate, withdrew the attention of the Arabs from th empire for a short time, and Constans turned his force against the Sclavonians, in order to deliver the European pr vinces from their ravages. They were totally defeated, numbe were carried off as slaves, and many were compelled to submi

[1] Theophanes, 287. Abulpharag. *Ch. Syr.* 88.

to the imperial authority. No certain grounds exist for determining whether this expedition was directed against the Sclavonians, who had established themselves between the Danube and Mount Hæmus, or against those who had settled in Macedonia. The name of no town is mentioned in the accounts of the campaign.[1]

When the affairs of the European provinces, in the vicinity of the capital, were tranquillised, Constans again prepared to engage the Arabs; and Moawyah, having need of all the forces he could command for his contest with Ali, the son-in-law of Mahomet, consented to make peace, on terms which contrast curiously with the perpetual defeats which Constans is always represented by the orthodox historians of the empire to have suffered. The Saracens engaged to confine their forces within Syria and Mesopotamia, and Moawyah consented to pay Constans, for the cessation of hostilities, the sum of a thousand pieces of silver, and to furnish him with a slave and a horse for every day during which the peace should continue. A.D. 659.

During the subsequent year, Constans condemned to death his brother Theodosius, whom he had compelled to enter the priesthood. The cause of this crime, or the pretext for it, is not mentioned. From this brother's hand, the emperor had often received the sacrament; and the fratricide is supposed to have rendered a residence at Constantinople insupportable to the conscience of the criminal, who was reported nightly to behold the spectre of his brother offering him the consecrated cup, filled with human blood, and exclaiming, "Drink, brother!" Certain it is, that two years after his brother's death, Constans quitted his capital, with the intention of never returning; and he was only prevented, by an insurrection of the people, from carrying off the empress and his children. He meditated the reconquest of Italy from the Lombards, and proposed rendering Rome again the seat of empire. On his way to Italy the emperor stopped at Athens, where he assembled a considerable body of troops. This casual mention of Athens by Latin writers affords strong evidence of the tranquil, flourishing; and populous condition of the city and country around.[2] The Sclavonian colonies in Greece must, at this time, have owned perfect allegiance to the

1 Theophanes, *Ch.* pp. 288, 299. Zinkeisen, i. 733. Tafel, *Thessalonica*, lxxxiii.
2 Anastasius, *De Vitis Pont. Rom.* p. 51, edit. Par. Schlosser, *Geschichte der Bilderstürmenden Kaiser*, 81.

imperial power, or Constans would certainly have employed his army in reducing them to subjection. From Athens, the emperor sailed to Italy; he landed with his forces at Tarentum, and attempted to take Beneventum, the chief seat of the Lombard power in the south of Italy. His troops were twice defeated, and he then abandoned all his projects of conquest.

The emperor himself repaired to Rome. His visit lasted only a fortnight. According to the writers who describe the event, he consecrated twelve days to religious ceremonies and processions, and the remaining two he devoted to plundering the wealth of the church. His personal acquaintance with the affairs of Italy and the state of Rome, soon convinced him that the eternal city was ill adapted for the capital of the empire, and he quitted it for Sicily, where he fixed on Syracuse for his future residence. Grimoald, the able monarch of the Lombards, and his son Romuald, the duke of Beneventum, continued the war in Italy with vigour. Brundusium and Tarentum were captured, and the Romans expelled from Calabria, so that Otranto and Gallipoli were the only towns on the eastern coast of which Constans retained possession.

When residing in Sicily, Constans directed his attention to the state of Africa. His measures are not detailed with precision, but were evidently distinguished by the usual energy and caprice which marked his whole conduct. He recovered possession of Carthage, and of several cities which the Arabs had rendered tributary; but he displeased the inhabitants of the province, by compelling them to pay to himself the same amount of tribute as they had agreed by treaty to pay to the Saracens; and as Constans could not expel the Saracen forces from the province, the amount of the public taxes of the Africans was thus often doubled,—since both parties were able to levy the contributions which they demanded. Moawyah sent an army from Syria, and Constans one from Sicily, to decide who should become sole master of the country. A battle was fought near Tripoli; and though the army of Constans consisted of thirty thousand men, it was completely defeated. Yet the victorious army of the Saracens was unable to take the small town of Geloula (Usula), until the accidental fall of a portion of the ramparts laid it open to their assault; and this trifling conquest was followed by no farther success. In the East, the empire was exposed to greater danger, yet the enemies of Constans were eventually unsuccessful in their projects. In consequence of the rebellion of the Armenian

troops, whose commander, Sapor, assumed the title of emperor, the Saracens made a successful incursion into Asia Minor, captured the city of Amorium, in Phrygia, and placed in it a garrison of five thousand men; but the imperial general appointed by Constans soon drove out this powerful garrison, and recovered the place.

It appears, therefore, that in spite of all the defeats which Constans is reported to have suffered, the empire underwent no very sensible diminution of its territory during his reign, and he certainly left its military forces in a more efficient condition than he found them. He was assassinated in a bath at Syracuse, by an officer of his household, in the year 668, at the age of thirty-eight, after a reign of twenty-seven years. The fact of his having been murdered by one of his own household, joined to the capricious violence that marked many of his public acts, warrants the supposition that his character was of the unamiable and unsteady nature, which rendered the accusation of fratricide, so readily believed by his contemporaries, by no means impossible. It must, however, be admitted, that the occurrences of his reign afford irrefragable testimony that his heretical opinions have induced orthodox historians to give an erroneous colouring to many circumstances, since the undoubted results do not correspond with their descriptions of the passing events.

Section IV

CONSTANTINE IV. YIELDED TO THE POPULAR ECCLESIASTICAL PARTY AMONG THE GREEKS

Constantine IV., called Pogonatus, or the Bearded, has been regarded by posterity with a high degree of favour.[1] Yet his merit seems to have consisted in his superior orthodoxy, rather than in his superior talents as emperor. The concessions which he made to the see of Rome, and the moderation that he displayed in all ecclesiastical affairs, placed his conduct in strong contrast with the stern energy with which his father had enforced the subjection of the orthodox ecclesiastics to the civil power, and gained for him the praise of the priesthood, whose eulogies have exerted no inconsiderable influence on all historians. Constantine, however, was cer-

[1] Constantine IV. is called Pogonatus, but it is his father who is called Constantine on his coins, and is represented with an enormous beard.

tainly an intelligent and just prince, who, though he did no possess the stubborn determination and talents of his fathe was destitute also of his violent passions and imprudent character.

As soon as Constantine was informed of the murder of hi father, and that a rebel had assumed the purple in Sicily, h hastened thither in person to avenge his death, and extinguis the rebellion. To satisfy his vengeance, the patrician Justin ian, a man of high character, compromised in the rebellion was treated with great severity, and his son Germanos with degree of inhumanity that would have been recorded by th clergy against Constans as an instance of the grossest bar barity.[1] The return of the emperor to Constantinople wa signalised by a singular sedition of the troops in Asia Mino They marched towards the capital, and having encamped o the Asiatic shores of the Bosphorus, demanded that Con stantine should admit his two brothers, on whom he had conferred the rank of Augustus, to an equal share in the public administration, in order that the Holy Trinity in heaven, which governs the spiritual world, might be repre sented by a human trinity, to govern the political empire o the Christians. The very proposal is a proof of the complete supremacy of the civil over the ecclesiastical authority, in the eyes of the people, and the strongest evidence, that in the public opinion of the age the emperor was regarded as the head of the church. Such reasoning as the rebels used could be rebutted by no arguments, and Constantine had energy enough to hang the leaders of the sedition, and sufficient moderation not to molest his brothers. But several years later either from increased suspicions, or from some intrigues on their part, he deprived them of the rank of Augustus, and con demned them to have their noses cut off[2] (A.D. 681). The condemnation of his brother to death by Constans, figures in history as one of the blackest crimes of humanity, while the barbarity of the orthodox Constantine is passed over as a lawful act. Both rest on the same authority, on the testimony of Theophanes, the earliest Greek chronicler, and both may really have been acts of justice necessary for the security of the throne and the tranquillity of the empire. Constans was a

[1] This Germanos, notwithstanding his mutilation by Constantine, became bishop of Cyzicus, and joined the Monothelites in the reign of Philippicus. He retracted, and was made patriarch of Constantinople by Anastasius II. (A.D. 715), and figured as an active defender of images against Leo III., the Isaurian.

[2] Theophanes, *Chron.* 298, 303.

man of a violent temper, and Constantine of a mild disposition; both may have been equally just, but both were, without doubt, unnecessarily severe. A brother's political offences could hardly merit a greater punishment from a brother than seclusion in a monastery.[1]

The great object of the imperial policy at this period was to oppose the progress of the Mohammedans. Constans had succeeded in arresting their conquests, but Constantine soon found that they would give the empire no rest unless he could secure it by his victories. He had hardly quitted Sicily to return to Constantinople, before an Arab expedition from Alexandria invaded the island, and stormed the city of Syracuse, and after plundering the treasures accumulated by Constans, immediately abandoned the place. In Africa the war was continued with various success, but the Christians were long left without any succours from Constantine, while Moawyah supplied the Saracens with strong reinforcements. In spite of the courage and enthusiasm of the Mohammedans, the native Christian population maintained their ground with firmness, and carried on the war with such vigour, that in the year 676 a native African leader, who commanded the united forces of the Romans and Berbers, captured the newly founded city of Kairowan, which at a subsequent period became renowned as the capital of the Fatimite caliphs.[2]

The ambition of the caliph Moawyah induced him to aspire to the conquest of the Roman empire; and the military organisation of the Arabian power, which enabled the caliph to direct the whole resources of his dominions to any single object of conquest, seemed to promise success to the enterprise. A powerful expedition was sent to besiege Constantinople. The time required for the preparation of such an armament did not enable the Saracens to arrive at the Bosphorus without passing a winter on the coast of Asia Minor, and on their arrival in the spring of the year 672, they found that the emperor had made every preparation for defence. Their forces, however, were so numerous, that they were sufficient to invest Constantinople by sea and land. The troops occupied the whole of the land side of the triangle on which the city is constructed, while the fleet effectually blockaded the

[1] Theophanes (293, 300) says that the brothers of Constantine IV. lost their noses in 681, but were not deprived of the imperial title until 681.

[2] Kairowan was founded by Akbah in 670; taken by the Christians in 676; recovered by the Arabs under Zohair; but retaken by the Christians in 683; and finally conquered by Hassan in 697.

port. The Saracens failed in all their assaults, both by sea and land; but the Romans, instead of celebrating their own valour and discipline, attributed their success principally to the use of the Greek fire, which was invented shortly before this siege, and was first used on this occasion.[1] The military art had declined during the preceding century, as rapidly as every other branch of national culture; and the resources of the mighty empire of the Arabs were so limited by the ignorance and bad administration of its rulers, that the caliph was unable to maintain his forces before Constantinople during the winter. The Saracen army was nevertheless enabled to collect sufficient supplies at Cyzicus to make that place a winter station, while their powerful fleet commanded the Hellespont and secured their communications with Syria. When spring returned, the fleet again transported the army to encamp under the walls of Constantinople. This strange mode of besieging cities, unattempted since the times the Dorians had invaded Peloponnesus, was continued for seven years; but in this warfare the Saracens suffered far more severely than the Romans, and were at last compelled to abandon the enterprise.[2] The land forces tried to effect their retreat through Asia Minor, but were entirely cut off in the attempt; and a tempest destroyed the greater part of their fleet off the coast of Pamphylia. During the time that this great body of his forces was employed against Constantinople, Moawyah sent a division of his troops to invade Crete, which had been visited by a Saracen army in 651. The island was now compelled to pay tribute, but the inhabitants were treated with great mildness, as it was the policy of the caliph at this time to conciliate the good opinion of the Christians by his liberal government, in order to pave the way for future conquests. Moawyah carried his religious tolerance so far as to rebuild the church of Edessa, at the intercession of his Christian subjects.

The destruction of the Saracen expedition against Constantinople, and the advantage which the mountaineers of Lebanon had contrived to take of the absence of the Arab troops, by carrying their incursions into the plains of Syria, convinced

[1] For an account of the Greek fire, see the articles "Callinicus" (vi. 551), and "Marcus Græcus" (xxvi. 623) in the *Biographie Universelle*.

[2] During the siege of Constantinople, Abou Ayoub, who had received Mahomet in his house on his flight to Medina, died; and the celebrated mosque of Ayoub, in which the Sultan, on his accession, receives the investiture of the sword, is said to mark the spot where he was buried.—See the chronology of the operations of the siege, 21.

Moawyah of the necessity of peace. The hardy mountaineers of Lebanon, called Mardaïtes, had been increased in numbers, and supplied with wealth, in consequence of the retreat into their country of a mass of native Syrians who had fled before the Arabs.[1] They consisted chiefly of Melchites and Monothelites, and on that account they had adhered to the cause of the Roman empire when the Monophysites joined the Saracens. Their Syrian origin renders it probable that they were ancestors of the Maronites, though the desire of some Maronite historians to show that their countrymen were always perfectly orthodox, has perplexed a question which of itself was by no means of easy solution.[2] The political state of the empire required peace; and the orthodox Constantine did not feel personally inclined to run any risk in order to protect the Monothelite Mardaïtes. Peace was concluded between the emperor and the caliph in the year 678, Moawyah consenting to pay the Romans annually three thousand pounds of gold, fifty slaves, and fifty Arabian horses. It appears strange that a prince, possessing the power and resources at the command of Moawyah, should submit to these conditions; but the fact proves that policy, not pride, was the rule of the caliph's conduct, and that the advancement of his real power, and of the spiritual interests of the Mohammedan religion, were of more consequence in his eyes than any notions of earthly dignity.

In the same year in which Moawyah had been induced to purchase peace by consenting to pay tribute to the Roman emperor, the foundations of the Bulgarian monarchy were laid, and the emperor Constantine himself was compelled to become tributary to a small horde of Bulgarians. One of the usual emigrations which take place amongst barbarous nations had induced Asparuch, a Bulgarian chief, to seize the new country about the mouth of the Danube; his power and activity obliged the emperor Constantine to take the field against these Bulgarians in person. The expedition was so ill conducted, that it ended in the complete defeat of the Roman army, and the Bulgarians subdued all the country between the Danube and Mount Hæmus, compelling a district inhabited by a body of Sclavonians, called the seven tribes, to become their tributaries. These Sclavonians had once been formid-

[1] The earliest mention of the Mardaïtes is found in Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 295.
[2] Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, with notes by James Murdock, D.D. Edited by Rev. H. Soames, ii. 109.

able to the empire, but their power had been broken by t emperor Constans. Asparuch established himself in the to of Varna, near the ancient Odessus, and laid the foundati of the Bulgarian monarchy, a kingdom long engaged in hos lities with the emperors of Constantinople, and whose pow tended greatly to accelerate the decline of the Greeks, and duce the numbers of their race in Europe.[1]

The event, however, which exercised the most favoura influence on the internal condition of the empire during t reign of Constantine Pogonatus, was the assembly of the six general council of the church at Constantinople. Th council was held under circumstances peculiarly favourably candid discussion. The ecclesiastical power was not yet t strong to set both reason and the civil authorities at defian Its decisions were adverse to the Monothelites; and t orthodox doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ w received by the common consent of the Greek and Lat parties as the true rule of faith of the Christian churc Religious discussion had now taken a strong hold on pub opinion, and as the majority of the Greek population h never adopted the opinions of the Monothelites, the decisio of the sixth general council contributed powerfully to promo the union of the Greeks with the imperial administration.

Section V

Depopulation of the Empire, and Decrease of the Greeks under Justinian II

Justinian II. succeeded his father Constantine at the a of sixteen, and though so very young, he immediately assum the personal direction of the government. He was by means destitute of talents, but his cruel and presumptuo character rendered him incapable of learning to perform t duties of his situation with justice. His violence at l rendered him hateful to his subjects; and as the connecti of the emperor with the Roman government and people w direct and personal, his power was so undermined by the l of his influence, that, in the ninth year of his reign, he w easily driven from his throne by a popular sedition. H nose was cut off, and he was banished to Cherson, A.D. 6 In exile his energy and activity enabled him to secure t

[1] Ducange, *Familiæ Byzantinæ*, p. 305. Theophanes, *Chron.* 298.

lliance of the Khazars and Bulgarians, and he returned to Constantinople as a conqueror, after an absence of ten years. His character was one of those to which experience is useless, nd he persisted in his former course of violence, until, having xhausted the patience of his subjects, he was dethroned and nurdered, A.D. 705–711.

The reign of such a tyrant was not likely to be inactive. At its commencement, he turned his arms against the Saracens, nough the caliph Abdalmelik offered to make additional con- essions, in order to induce the emperor to renew the treaty f peace which had been concluded with his father. Justinian ent a powerful army into Armenia under Leontius, by whom e was subsequently dethroned. All the provinces which had nown any disposition to favour the Saracens were laid waste, nd the army carried off an immense booty, and drove away great part of the inhabitants as slaves. The barbarism of ne Roman government had now reached such a pitch that ne Roman armies were permitted to plunder and depopulate ven those provinces where a Christian population still afforded ne emperor some assurance that they might be retained in ermanent subjection to the Roman government. The soldiers f an undisciplined army,—legionaries without patriotism or ationality, were allowed to enrich themselves by slave hunts n Christian countries, and the most flourishing agricultural istricts were reduced to deserts, incapable of offering any esistance to the Mohammedan nomades. The caliph Abdal- nelik, being engaged in a struggle for the caliphate with owerful rivals, and disturbed by rebels even in his own yrian dominions, arrested the progress of the Roman arms y purchasing peace on terms far more favourable to the npire than those of the treaty between Constantine and Moawyah. The caliph engaged to pay the emperor an annual ibute of three hundred and sixty-five thousand pieces of old, three hundred and sixty slaves, and three hundred and xty Arabian horses. The provinces of Iberia, Armenia, and yprus, were equally divided between the Romans and the rabs; but Abdalmelik obtained the principal advantage from ne treaty, for Justinian not only consented to abandon the ause of the Mardaïtes, but even engaged to assist the caliph n expelling them from Syria. This was effected by the eachery of Leontius, who entered their country as a friend, nd murdered their chief. Twelve thousand Mardaïte soldiers ere enrolled in the armies of the empire, and distributed

in garrisons in Armenia and Thrace. A colony of Mardaïte was established at Attalia in Pamphylia, and the power of the valiant people was completely broken. The removal of the Mardaïtes from Syria was one of the most serious errors of the reign of Justinian. As long as they remained in force on Mount Lebanon, near the centre of the Saracen power, the emperor was able to render them a serious check on the Mohammedans, and create dangerous diversions whenever the caliphs invaded the empire. Unfortunately, in this age of religious bigotry, the Monothelite opinions of the Mardaïtes made them an object of aversion or suspicion to the imperial administration; and even under the prudent government of Constantine Pogonatus, they were not viewed with a friendly eye, nor did they receive the support which should have been granted to them on a just consideration of the interests of Christianity, as well as of the Roman empire.

The general depopulation of the empire suggested to many of the Roman emperors the project of repeopling favoured districts, by an influx of new inhabitants. The origin of many of the most celebrated cities of the Eastern Empire could be traced back to small Greek colonies. These emigrants, it was known, had rapidly increased in number and risen to wealth. The Roman government appears never to have clearly comprehended that the same causes which produced the diminution of the ancient population would be sure to prevent the increase of new settlers; and their attempts at repeopling provinces, and removing the population of one district to new seats, were frequently renewed. Justinian II had a great taste for these emigrations. Three years after the conclusion of peace with Abdalmelik, he resolved to withdraw all the inhabitants from the half of the island of Cyprus of which he remained master, in order to prevent the Christians from becoming accustomed to the Saracen administration. The Cypriote population was transported to a new city near Cyzicus, which the emperor called after himself, Justinianopolis. It is needless to offer any remarks on the impolicy of such a project; the loss of life, and the destruction of property inevitable in the execution of such a scheme, could only have been replaced under the most favourable circumstances, and by a long career of prosperity. It is known that in consequence of this desertion, many of the Cypriote towns fell into complete ruin, from which they have never since emerged.

Justinian, at the commencement of his reign, made a ıccessful expedition into the country occupied by the clavonians in Macedonia, who were now closely allied with ıe Bulgarian principality beyond Mount Hæmus. This eople, emboldened by their increased force, had pushed their lundering excursions as far the Propontis. The imperial rmy was completely successful, and both the Sclavonians and ıeir Bulgarian allies were defeated. In order to repeople the ertile shores of the Hellespont about Abydos, Justinian ransplanted a number of the Sclavonian families into the rovince of Opsicium. This colony was so numerous and owerful, that it furnished a considerable contingent to the mperial armies.[1]

The peace with the Saracens was not of long duration. ustinian refused to receive the first gold pieces coined by bdalmelik, which bore the legend, "God is the Lord." The ibute had previously been paid in money from the municipal ints of Syria; and Justinian imagined that the new Arabian oinage was an attack on the Holy Trinity. He led his army ı person against the Saracens, and a battle took place near ebastopolis, on the coast of Cilicia, in which he was entirely efeated, in consequence of the treason of the leader of his clavonian troops.[2] Justinian fled from the field of battle, ıd on his way to the capital he revenged himself on the clavonians who had remained faithful to his standard for the esertion of their countrymen. The Sclavonians in his ervice were put to death, and he even ordered the wives and ıildren of those who had joined the Saracens to be murdered. he deserters were established by the Saracens on the coast Syria, and in the island of Cyprus; and under the govern- ent of the caliph, they were more prosperous than under ıat of the Roman emperor. It was during this war that the ıracens inflicted the first great badge of civil degradation on ıe Christian population of their dominions. Abdalmelik tablished the Haratch, or Christian capitation tax, in order raise money to carry on the war with Justinian. This ıfortunate mode of taxing the Christian subjects of the caliph, a different manner from the Mohammedans, completely parated the two classes, and reduced the Christians to the nk of serfs of the State, whose most prominent political

1 30,000.—Nicephorus Pat. 24. Theophanes, 305.
2 The Sclavonian leader Gebulus, or Nebulus, carried off 20,000 men, according to eophanes (305); but Saint-Martin cites an Armenian historian who reduces the mber to 7000 cavalry.—Lebeau, xii. 22.

relation with the Mussulman community was that of furnish money to the government. The decline of the Christ population throughout the dominions of the caliphs was t consequence of this ill-judged measure, which has probab tended more to the depopulation of the East than all t tyranny and military violence of the Mohammedan armies.

The restless spirit of Justinian naturally plunged into t ecclesiastical controversies which divided the church. H assembled a general council, called usually *in Trullo*, from t hall of its meeting having been covered with a dome. Th proceedings of this council, as might have been expected fro those of an assembly controlled by such a spirit as that of t emperor, tended only to increase the growing differenc between the Greek and Latin parties in the church. Of o hundred and two canons sanctioned by this council, the po finally rejected six, as adverse to the usages of the Latin And thus an additional cause of separation was permanen created between the Greeks and Latins, and the measures the church, as well as the political arrangements of the time and the social feelings of the people, all tended to rend union impossible.

A taste for building is a common fancy of sovereigns wh possess the absolute disposal of large funds without an feeling of their duty as trustees for the benefit of the peop whom they govern. Even in the midst of the greatest publ distress, the treasury of nations, on the very verge of ruin an bankruptcy, must contain large sums of money drawn fro the annual taxation. This treasure, when placed at th irresponsible disposal of princes who affect magnificence, frequently employed in useless and ornamental building: an this fashion has been so general with despots, that the princ who have been most distinguished for their love of buildin have not unfrequently been the worst and most oppressiv sovereigns. It is always a delicate and difficult task for sovereign to estimate the amount which a nation can wise afford to expend on ornamental architecture; and, from h position, he is seldom qualified to judge correctly on wh buildings ornament ought to be employed, in order to mak

[1] Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* by Murdock, Soame's edit. ii. 111. The six canc rejected were—the fifth, which approves of the eighty-five apostolic canons, common attributed to Clement; the thirteenth, which allows priests to live in wedlock; t fifty-fifth, which condemns fasting on Saturdays; the sixty-seventh, which ex enjoins abstinence from blood and things strangled; the eighty-second, which prohib the painting of Christ in the image of a lamb; and the eighty-sixth, concerning t equality of the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.—Schlegel's note.

rt accord with the taste and feelings of the people. Public pinion affords the only criterion for the formation of a sound udgment on this department of public administration; for, hen princes possessing a taste for building are not compelled o consult the wants and wishes of their subjects, in the con- truction of national edifices, they are apt, by their wild rojects and lavish expenditure, to create evils far greater than ny which could result from an exhibition of bad taste alone.

In an evil hour, the love of building took possession of ustinian's mind. His lavish expenditure soon obliged him o make his financial administration more rigorous, and eneral discontent quickly pervaded the capital. The religious nd superstitious feelings of the population were severely ounded by the emperor's eagerness to destroy a church of ne Virgin, in order to embellish the vicinity of his palace ith a splendid fountain. Justinian's own scruples required o be soothed by a religious ceremony, but the patriarch for ome time refused to officiate, alleging that the church had no rayers to desecrate holy buildings. The emperor, however, as the head of the church and the master of the bishops, hom he could remove from office, so that the patriarch did ot long dare to refuse obedience to his orders. It is said, owever, that the patriarch showed very clearly his dissatis- ction, by repairing to the spot and authorising the destruction f the church by an ecclesiastical ceremony, to which he dded these words, "to God, who suffers all things, be ren- ered glory, now and for ever. Amen." The ceremony was fficient to satisfy the conscience of the emperor, who perhaps either heard nor heeded the words of the patriarch. The ublic discontent was loudly expressed, and Justinian soon erceived that the fury of the populace threatened a rebellion t Constantinople. To avert the danger, he took every easure which unscrupulous cruelty could suggest; but, as enerally happens in periods of general discontent and excite- ent, the storm burst in an unexpected quarter, and the atred of Justinian left him suddenly without support. eontius, one of the ablest generals of the empire, whose xploits have been already mentioned, had been thrown into ison, but was at this time ordered to assume the government the province of Hellas. He considered the nomination as mere pretext to remove him from the capital, in order to it him to death at a distance without any trial. On the eve his departure, Leontius placed himself at the head of a

sedition; Justinian was seized, and his ministers we murdered by the populace with the most savage cruel Leontius was proclaimed emperor, but he spared the life his dethroned predecessor for the sake of the benefits whi he had received from Constantine Pogonatus. He order Justinian's nose to be cut off, and exiled him to Chersoi From this mutilation the dethroned emperor received t insulting nickname of Rhinotmetus, or Docknose, by whi he is distinguished in Byzantine history.

Section VI

Anarchy in the Administration until the Accession of Leo III

The government of Leontius was characterised by the u steadiness which not unfrequently marks the administration the ablest sovereigns who obtain their thrones by accident circumstances rather than by systematic combinations. T most important event of his reign was the final loss of Afric which led to his dethronement. The indefatigable calip Abdalmelik despatched a powerful expedition into Afri under Hassan; the province was soon conquered, and Carthag was captured after a feeble resistance.[1] An expedition se by Leontius to relieve the province arrived too late to sa Carthage, but the commander-in-chief forced the entrance in the port, recovered possession of the city, and drove the Ara from most of the fortified towns on the coast. The Arai constantly received new reinforcements, which the Roma general demanded from Leontius in vain. At last the Ara assembled a fleet, and the Romans, being defeated in a nav engagement, were compelled to abandon Carthage, which t Arabs utterly destroyed,—having too often experienced t superiority of the Romans, both in naval affairs and in the a of war, to venture on retaining populous and fortified cities the sea coast. This curious fact affords strong proof of t great superiority of the Roman commerce and naval resource and equally powerful evidence of the shameful disorder in t civil and military administration of the empire, which re dered these advantages useless, and allowed the imperial flee

[1] Carthage was founded B.C. 878. The Tyrian colony was exterminated by Romans B.C. 146. The Roman colony of Carthage was founded by Julius Ca B.C. 44, and destroyed by the Arabs A.D. 698.

to be defeated by the naval forces collected by the Arabs from among their Egyptian and Syrian subjects. At the same time it is evident that the naval victories of the Arabs could never have been gained unless a powerful party of the Christians had been induced, by their feelings of hostility to the Roman empire, to afford them a willing support; for there were as yet neither shipbuilders nor sailors among the Mussulmans.

The Roman expedition, on its retreat from Carthage, stopped in the island of Crete, where a sedition broke out among the troops, in which their general was killed. Apsimar, the commander of the Cibyraiot troops, was declared emperor by the name of Tiberius.[1] The fleet proceeded directly to Constantinople, which offered no resistance. Leontius was taken prisoner, his nose cut off, and his person confined in a monastery. Tiberius Apsimar governed the empire with prudence, and his brother Heraclius commanded the Roman armies with success. The imperial troops penetrated into Syria; a victory was gained over the Arabs at Samosata, but the ravages committed by the Romans in this invasion surpassed the greatest cruelties ever inflicted by the Arabs; for two hundred thousand Saracens are said to have perished during the campaign. Armenia was alternately invaded and laid waste by the Romans and the Saracens, as the various turns of war favoured the hostile parties, and as the changing interests of the Armenian population induced them to aid the emperor or the caliph. But while Tiberius was occupied in the duties of government, and living without any fear of a domestic enemy, he was suddenly surprised in his capital by Justinian, who appeared before Constantinople at the head of a Bulgarian army.

Ten years of exile had been spent by the banished emperor in vain attempts to obtain power. His violent proceedings made him everywhere detested, but he possessed the daring enterprise and the ferocious cruelty necessary for a chief of banditti, joined to a singular confidence in the value of his hereditary claim to the imperial throne; so that no undertaking appeared to him hopeless. After quarrelling with the inhabitants of Cherson, and with his brother-in-law, the king

1 The Cibyraiot Theme included the ancient Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, and a part of Phrygia; Cibyra Magna was a considerable town at the angle of Phrygia, Caria, and Lycia. Tiberius Cæsar was regarded as its second founder, from his having remitted the tribute after a severe earthquake.—Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 13. From him Apsimar must have taken the name of Tiberius, and not from the emperor of Constantinople of better name. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, indeed, says the Theme in question was named from the insignificant town of Cibyra in Pamphylia, but his authority is of little value on such a point.—*De Them.* lib. i. p. 16.

of the Khazars, he succeeded, by a desperate exertion c courage, in reaching the country of the Bulgarians. Terbeli their sovereign, agreed to assist him in recovering his thron and they marched immediately with a Bulgarian army to th walls of Constantinople. Three days after their arrival, the succeeded in entering the capital during the night. Ten yea of adversity had increased the natural ferocity of Justinian disposition; and a desire of vengeance, so unreasonable as t verge on madness, seems henceforward to have been the chi motive of his actions. The population of Constantinople ha now sunk to the same degree of barbarism as the nations su rounding them, and in cruelty they were worthy subjects c their emperor. Justinian gratified them by celebrating h restoration with splendid chariot races in the circus. He sat on an elevated throne, with his feet resting on the necks of th dethroned emperors, Leontius and Tiberius, who were stretche on the platform below, while the Greek populace aroun shouted the words of the Psalmist, "Thou shalt tread dow the asp and the basilisk, thou shalt trample on the lion an the dragon."[1] The dethroned emperors and Heraclius, wh had so well sustained the glory of the Roman arms against th Saracens, were afterwards hung from the battlements of Cor stantinople. Justinian's whole soul was occupied with plan of vengeance. Though the conquest of Tyana laid open Asi Minor to the incursions of the Saracens, instead of opposin them, he directed his disposable forces to punish the cities c Ravenna and Cherson, because they had incurred his persona hatred. Both the proscribed cities had rejoiced at his de thronement; they were both taken and treated with savag cruelty. The Greek city of Cherson, though the seat c a flourishing commerce, and inhabited by a numerous popul tion, was condemned to utter destruction. Justinian ordere all the buildings to be razed with the ground, and every sou within its walls to be put to death; but the troops sent t execute these barbarous orders revolted, and proclaimed a Armenian, called Bardanes, emperor, under the name c Philippicus.[2] Seizing the fleet, they sailed directly to Cor stantinople. Justinian was encamped with an army in Asi Minor when Philippicus arrived and took possession of th

[1] These are the words of the Septuagint, Psalm xc. 13. In our version, Psalm xci. 1 the passage stands, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder; the young lion and t dragon shalt thou trample under feet."

[2] Theophanes calls him the son of Nicephorus the Patrician.—P. 311. Nicepho Pat. mentions that he was an Armenian.—P. 50, edit. Bonn.

capital without encountering any resistance. He was immediately deserted by his whole army, for the troops were as little pleased with his conduct since his restoration, as was every other class of his subjects; but his ferocity and courage never failed him, and his rage was unbounded when he found himself abandoned by every one. He was seized and executed, without having it in his power to offer the slightest resistance. His son Tiberius, though only six years of age, was torn from the altar of a church, to which he had been conducted for safety, and cruelly massacred; and thus the race of Heraclius was extinguished, after the family had governed the Roman empire for exactly a century (A.D. 611 to 711).

During the interval of six years which elapsed from the death of Justinian II. to the accession of Leo the Isaurian, the imperial throne was occupied by three sovereigns. Their history is only remarkable as proving the inherent strength of the Roman body politic, which could survive such continual revolutions, even in the state of weakness to which it was reduced. Philippicus was a luxurious and extravagant prince, who thought only of enjoying the situation which he had accidentally obtained, He was soon dethroned by a band of conspirators, who carried him off from the palace while in a fit of drunkenness, and after putting out his eyes, left him helpless in the middle of the hippodrome. The reign of Philippicus would hardly deserve notice, had he not increased the confusion into which the empire had fallen, and exposed the total want of character and conscience among the Greek clergy, by re-establishing the Monothelite doctrines in a general council of the eastern bishops.

As the conspirators who had dethroned Philippicus had not formed any plan for choosing his successor, the first secretary of state was elected emperor by a public assembly held in the great church of St. Sophia, under the name of Anastasius II. He immediately re-established the orthodox faith, and his character is consequently the subject of eulogy with the historians of his reign.[1] The Saracens, whose power was continually increasing, were at this time preparing a great expedition at Alexandria, in order to attack Constantinople. Anastasius sent a fleet with the troops of the theme Opsicium, to destroy the magazines of timber collected on the coast of Phœnicia for the purpose of assisting the preparations at Alexandria. The Roman armament was commanded by

[1] Nicephorus Pat. 32. Theophanes, 322.

a deacon of St. Sophia, who also held the office of grand treasurer of the empire. The nomination of a member of the clergy to command the army gave great dissatisfaction to the troops, who were not yet so deeply tinctured with ecclesiastical ideas and manners, as the aristocracy of the empire. A sedition took place while the army lay at Rhodes: John the Deacon was slain, and the expedition quitted the port in order to return to the capital. The soldiers on their way landed at Adramyttium, and finding there a collector of the revenues of a popular character, they declared him emperor, under the name of Theodosius III.

The new emperor was compelled unwillingly to follow the army. For six months, Constantinople was closely besieged, and the emperor Anastasius, who had retired to Nicæa, was defeated in a general engagement. The capital was at last taken by the rebels, who were so deeply sensible of their real interests, that they maintained strict discipline, and Anastasius, whose weakness gave little confidence to his followers, consented to resign the empire to Theodosius, and to retire into a monastery, that he might secure an amnesty to all his friends. Theodosius was distinguished by many good qualities, but on the throne he proved a perfect cipher, and his reign is only remarkable as affording a pretext for the assumption of the imperial dignity by Leo III., called the Isaurian. This able and enterprising officer, perceiving that the critical times rendered the empire the prize of any man who had talents to seize, and power to defend it, placed himself at the head of the troops in Asia Minor, assumed the title of emperor, and soon compelled Theodosius to quit the throne and become a priest.

During the period which elapsed between the death of Heraclius and the accession of Leo, the few remains of Roman principles of administration which had lingered in the imperial court, were gradually extinguished. The long-cherished hope of restoring the ancient power and glory of the Roman empire expired, and even the aristocracy, which always clings the last to antiquated forms and ideas, no longer dwelt with confidence on the memory of former days. The conviction that the empire had undergone a great moral and political change, which severed the future irrevocably from the past, though it was probably not fully understood, was at least felt and acted on both by the people and the government. The sad fact that the splendid light of civilisation which had illuminated

he ancient world had now become as obscure at Constanti-
iople as at Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Carthage, was too
vident to be longer doubted; the very twilight of antiquity
ad faded into darkness. It is rather, however, the province
f the antiquary than of the historian to collect all the traces
f this truth scattered over the records of the seventh
entury.

There is one curious and important circumstance in the
istory of the later days of the Roman empire, of which little
eyond the mere fact has been transmitted by historians.
A long and violent contention was carried on between the
mperial power and the aristocracy, which represented the last
legenerate remains of the Roman senate. This struggle dis-
racted the councils and paralysed the energy of the Roman
overnment. It commenced in the reign of Maurice, and
xisted under various modifications during the whole period
f the government of the family of Heraclius. This aristo-
ratic influence had more of an oriental than of a Roman
haracter; its feelings and views had originated in that class
f society imbued with a semi-Greek civilisation which had
rown up during the days of the Macedonian rather than of
he Roman empire; and both Heraclius and Constans II., in
heir schemes for circumscribing its authority in the State,
esolved to remove the capital of the empire from Constanti-
iople to a Latin city. Both conceived the vain hope of
e-establishing the imperial power on a purely Roman basis,
s a means of subduing, or at least controlling, the power of
Greek nationality, which was gaining ground both in the State
nd the Church. The contest terminated in the destruction
f that political influence in the Eastern Empire, which was
urely Roman in its character. But the united power of
Greek and oriental feelings could not destroy the spirit of
Rome, until the well-organised civil administration of Augustus
nd Constantine ceased to exist. The subjects of the empire
vere no great gainers by the change. The political govern-
nent became a mere arbitrary despotism, differing little from
he prevailing form of monarchy in the East, and deprived of
ll those fundamental institutions, and that systematic char-
cter, which had enabled the Roman state to survive the
xtravagances of Nero and the incapacity of Phocas.

The disorganisation of the Roman government at this
eriod, and the want of any influence over the court by the
Greek nation, are visible in the choice of the persons who

occupied the imperial throne after the extinction of the famil of Heraclius. They were selected by accident, and severa were of foreign origin, who did not even look upon themselve as either Greeks or Romans. Philippicus was an Armenian and Leo III., whose reign opens a new era in eastern history was an Isaurian. On the throne he proved that he was dest tute of any attachment to Roman political institutions, an any respect for the Greek ecclesiastical establishment. It wa by the force of his talents, and by his able direction of th State and of the army, that he succeeded in securing his famil on the Byzantine throne; for he unquestionably placed him self in direct hostility to the feelings and opinions of hi Greek and Roman subjects, and transmitted to his successor a contest between the imperial power and the Greek nation concerning picture-worship, in which the very existence o Greek nationality, civilisation, and religion, became at last compromised. From the commencement of the iconoclasti contest, the history of the Greeks assumes a new aspect Their civilisation, and their connection with the Byzantine empire, become linked with the policy and fortunes of the Eastern Church, and ecclesiastical affairs obtain a supremacy over all social and political considerations in their minds.

Section VII

General View of the Condition of the Greeks at the Extinction of the Roman Power in the East

The geographical extent of the empire at the time of its transition from the Roman to the Byzantine empire affords evidence of the influence which the territorial changes pro duced by the Saracen conquests exercised in conferring political importance on the Greek race. The frontier towards the Saracens of Syria commenced at Mopsuestia in Cilicia the last fortress of the Arab power. It ran along the chains of Mounts Amanus and Taurus to the mountainous district to the north of Edessa and Nisibis, called, after the time of Justinian, the Fourth Armenia, of which Martyropolis was the capital. It then followed nearly the ancient limits of the empire until it reached the Black Sea, a short distance to the east of Trebizond. On the northern shores of the Euxine, Cherson was now the only city that acknowledged the supremacy of the empire, retaining at the same time all its

wealth and commerce, with the municipal privileges of a free city.[1] In Europe, Mount Hæmus formed the barrier against the Bulgarians, while the mountainous ranges which bound Macedonia to the north-west, and encircle the territory of Dyrrachium, were regarded as the limits of the free Sclavonian states. It is true that large bodies of Sclavonians had penetrated to the south of this line, and lived in Greece and Peloponnesus, but not in the same independent condition with reference to the imperial administration as their northern brethren of the Servian family.

Istria, Venice, and the cities on the Dalmatian coast, still acknowledged the supremacy of the empire, though their distant position, their commercial connections, and their religious feelings, were all tending towards a final separation. In the centre of Italy, the exarchate of Ravenna still held Rome in subjection, but the people of Italy were entirely alienated from the political administration, which was now regarded by them as purely Greek, and the Italians, with Rome before their eyes, could hardly admit the pretensions of the Greeks to be regarded as the legitimate representatives of the Roman empire. The loss of northern and central Italy was consequently an event in constant danger of occurring; it would have required an able and energetic and just government to have repressed the national feelings of the Italians, and conciliated their allegiance. The condition of the population of the south of Italy and of Sicily was very different. There the majority of the inhabitants were Greeks in language and manners; but at this time the cities of Gaëta, Naples, Amalfi, and Sorento, the district of Otranto, and the peninsula to the south of the ancient Sybaris, now called Calabria, were the only parts which remained under the Byzantine government. Sicily, though it had begun to suffer from the incursions of the Saracens, was still populous and wealthy. Sardinia, the last possession of the Greeks to the westward of Italy, was conquered by the Saracens about this time, A.D. 711.[2]

In order to conclude the view which, in the preceding pages, we have endeavoured to present of the various causes that gradually diminished the numbers, and destroyed the civilisation, of the Greek race, it is necessary to add a sketch of the position of the nation at the commencement of the

[1] Gibbon, ch. xvii. vol. ii. p. 360, Smith's edit. Constant. Porphyr. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 58.

[2] Price, *Mohammedan History*, i. 471.

eighth century. At this unfortunate period in the history o mankind, the Greeks were placed in imminent danger of tha annihilation which had already destroyed their Roman con querors. The victories of the Arabs were attended with ver different consequences to the Greek population of the countrie which they subdued, from those which had followed th conquests of the Romans. Like the earlier domination o the Parthians, the Arab power was employed in such a manne as ultimately to exterminate the whole Greek population i the conquered countries; and though, for a short period, th Arabs, like their predecessors the Parthians, protected Gree art and Grecian civilisation, their policy soon changed, an the Greeks were proscribed. The arts and sciences whic flourished at the court of the caliphs were chiefly derive from their Syrian subjects, whose acquaintance both wit Syriac and Greek literature opened to them an extensiv range of scientific knowledge from sources utterly lost to th moderns. It is to be observed, that a very great number o the eminent literary and scientific authors of later times wer Asiatics, and that these writers frequently made use of the native languages in those useful and scientific works whic were intended for the practical instruction of their ow countrymen. In Egypt and Cyrenaïca the Greek populatio was soon exterminated by the Arabs, and every trace o Grecian civilisation was much sooner effaced than in Syria though even there no very long interval elapsed before a sma remnant of the Greek population was all that survive Antioch itself, long the third city of the Eastern Empire, th spot where the Christians had first received their name,[1] an the principal seat of Greek civilisation in Asia for upwards o nine centuries, though it was not depopulated and razed t the ground like Alexandria and Carthage, nevertheless soo ceased to be a Grecian city.

The numerous Greek colonies which had flourished in th Tauric Chersonese, and on the eastern and northern shore of the Euxine, were now almost all deserted. The greate number had submitted to the Khazars, who now occupied a the open country with their flocks and herds: and th inhabitants of the free city of Cherson, shut out from th cultivation of the rich lands whose harvests had formerl supplied Athens with grain, were entirely supported by foreig commerce. Their ships exchanged the hides, wax, and sa

[1] Acts xi. 26.

sh of the neighbouring districts, for the necessaries and uxuries of a city life, in Constantinople and the maritime ities of the empire.[1] It affords matter for reflection to find hat Cherson,—situated in a climate which, from the foundation f the colony, opposed insurmountable barriers to the introuction of much of the peculiar character of Greek social ivilisation, and which deprived the art and the popular terature of the mother country of some portion of their harm,—to whose inhabitants the Greek temple, the Greek gora, and the Greek theatre, must ever have borne the haracteristics of foreign habits, and in a land where the iercing winds and heavy clouds prevented a life out of doors eing the essence of existence—should still have preserved, to his late period of history, both its Greek municipal organisaon, and its independent civic government. Yet such was he case; and we know from the testimony of Constantine orphyrogenitus, that Cherson continued to exist in a conition of respectable independence, though under imperial rotection, down to the middle of the tenth century.

In Greece itself the Hellenic race had been driven from any fertile districts by Sclavonian settlers, who had established hemselves in large bodies in Greece and the Peloponnesus, nd had often pushed their plundering and piratical incursions mong the islands of the Archipelago, from which they had urried off numerous bands of slaves.[2] In the cities and lands which the Greeks still possessed, the secluded position f the population, and the exclusive attention which they ere compelled to devote to their local interests and personal efence, introduced a degree of ignorance which soon extinished the last remains of Greek civilisation, and effaced all nowledge of Greek literature. The diminished population f the European Greeks now occupied the shores of the driatic to the south of Dyrrachium, and the maritime stricts of Greece, Macedonia, and Thrace, as far as Conantinople. The interior of the country was everywhere verrun by Sclavonic colonies, though many mountainous

[1] Leucon, king of Bosporus (B.C. 393–353), once sent to Athens from the Tauric ersonese, in a year of scarcity, upwards of two million bushels of grain. The ordinary portation was about six hundred thousand.—Strabo, vii. c. 4, vol. 2, 97, edit. Tauch. emosthenes, *in Leptin.* 467. In the time of Strabo, the eastern part of the Chersonese s a country very fertile in grain; but in that of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Cherson ported corn, wine, and oil as foreign luxuries. Gibbon, in copying Constantine rphyrogenitus when speaking of the time of Justinian II., omits to notice the comercial prosperity of the place, and represents it as a lonely settlement.—Ch. xlviii. vol. p. 78.—See pp. 152, 153, of this volume.

[2] Niceph. Pat. pp. 49, 86, edit. Bonn.

districts and most of the fortified places still remained in th possession of the Greeks. It is, unfortunately, impossible t explain with precision the real nature and extent of th Sclavonic colonisation of Greece; and, indeed, before it b possible to decide how far it partook of conquest, and how fa it resulted from the occupation of deserted and uncultivate lands, it becomes absolutely necessary to arrive at some definit information concerning the diminution which had taken plac in the native agricultural classes, and in the social position c the slaves and serfs who survived in the depopulated districts The scanty materials existing render the inquiry one whic can only engage the attention of the antiquary, who can glea a few isolated facts; but the historian must turn away fro the conjectures which would connect these facts into a system The condition of social life during the decline of the Roma empire had led to the division of the provincial populatio into two classes, the urban and the rustic, or into citizens an peasants; and the superior position and greater security of th citizens gradually enabled them to assume a political superiorit over the free peasants, and at last to reduce them, in a grea measure, to the rank of serfs.[1] Slaves became, about the sam time, of much greater relative value, and more difficult to b procured; and the distinction naturally arose between pur chased slaves, who formed a part of the household and of th family of the possessor, and agricultural serfs, whose partia liberty was attended by the severest hardships, and whos social condition was one of the lowest degradation and of th greatest personal danger. The population of Greece and th islands, in the time of Alexander the Great, may be estimate at three millions and a half;[2] and probably half of thi number consisted of slaves. During the vicissitudes of th Greek population under the Roman domination, the diminu tion of its numbers cannot have been less than the tota amount of the whole slave population, though the diminution did not fall exclusively on any one class of society. The extent, however, to which the general depopulation affecte the agricultural population, and the value of labour, must be ascertained before full light can be thrown on the real nature of the Sclavonic and Albanian colonisation of Greece.[3]

[1] *Cod. Just.* xi. t. 49, 1, l. *Cod. Theod.* v. par. t. 9 and 11, &c.
[2] Clinton's *Fasti Hell.* vol. ii. p. 431.
[3] The high value of labour in many thinly-peopled countries in a declining state, a Turkey, is a subject for curious investigation, as connected with the decline of one race of the population, and its replacement by another.

In the island of Sicily, and in the south of Italy, the great bulk of the population was Greek, both in language and manners, and few portions of the Greek race had succeeded so well in preserving their wealth and property uninjured.[1]

Even in Asia Minor the decline of the numbers of the Greek race had been rapid. This decline must, however, be attributed rather to bad government causing insecurity of property and difficulty of communication than to hostile invasions; for from the period of the Persian invasion during the reign of Heraclius, the greater part of this immense country had enjoyed almost a century of uninterrupted peace. The Persian invasions had never been very injurious to the sea-coast, where the Greek cities were still numerous and wealthy; but oppression and neglect had already destroyed the internal trade of the central provinces, and literary instruction was becoming daily of less value to the inhabitants of the isolated and secluded districts of the interior.[2] The Greek tongue began to be neglected, and the provincial dialects, corrupted by an admixture of the Lydian, Carian, Phrygian, Cappadocian, and Lycaonian languages, became the ordinary medium of business and conversation. Bad government had caused poverty, poverty had produced barbarism, and the ignorance created by barbarism became the means of perpetuating an arbitrary and oppressive system of administration. The people, ignorant of all written language, felt unable to check the exercise of official abuses by the control of the law, and by direct application to the central administration. Their wish, therefore, was to abridge as much as possible all the proceedings of power; and as it was always more easy to save their persons from the central power than their properties from the subordinate officers of the administration, despotism became the favourite form of government with the great mass of the Asiatic population.

It is impossible to attempt any detailed examination of the changes which had taken place in the numbers of the Greek population in Asia Minor. The fact that extensive districts, once populous and wealthy, were already deserts, is proved by

1 For the antiquity of the Greek race and language in Magna Græcia, see Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, i. 61, English trans. The Greek language continued in use until the fourteenth century.

2 The barbarism of the provincial Asiatics is often alluded to by the Byzantine writers. Λυκάονάς τινας ἢ λυκανθρώπους.—Theophanes, *Chron.* 406. For the existence of Lycaonian dialect, see Acts xiv. 11.

the colonies which Justinian II. settled in various parts of th country. The frequent repetition of such settlements, an the great extent to which they were carried by the late emperors, prove that the depopulation of the country had pro ceeded more rapidly than the destruction of its materia resources. The descendants of Greek and Roman citizen ceased to exist in districts, while the buildings stood tenantless and the olive groves yielded an abundant harvest. In th strange state of things the country easily received new races o inhabitants. The sudden settlement of a Sclavonian colon so numerous as to be capable of furnishing an auxiliary arm of thirty thousand men, and the unexpected migration o nearly half of the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus, witho mentioning the emigration of the Mardaïtes who were estab lished in Asia Minor, could never have taken place unless houses, wells, fruit-trees, water-courses, enclosures, and road had existed in tolerable preservation, and thus furnished th new colonist with an immense amount of what may be calle vested capital to assist his labour. The fact that these new colonies, planted by Justinian II., could survive and suppor themselves, seems a curious circumstance when connected wit the depopulation and declining state of the empire which le to their establishment.

The existence of numerous and powerful bands of organise brigands who plundered the country in defiance of the goverr ment was one of the features of society at this period, whic almost escapes the notice of the meagre historians whom w possess, though it existed to such an extent as materially t have aggravated the distress of the Greek population. Ever had history been entirely silent on the subject, there coul have been no doubt of their existence in the latter days of th Roman empire, from the knowledge which we have of th condition of the inhabitants, and of the geographical con formation of the land. History affords, however, a few casua glances of the extent of the evil. The existence of a tribe o brigands in the mountains of Thrace during a period of tw centuries, is proved by the testimony of authorities which th time and circumstances render unimpeachable. Menande mentions bands of robbers, under the name of Scamars, wh plundered the ambassadors sent by the Avars to the emperor Justin II.; and these Scamars continued to exist as a organised society of robbers in the same district until the time of Constantine V. (Copronymus), A.D. 765, when the capture

nd cruel torture of one of their chiefs is narrated by Theophanes.[1]

History also records numerous isolated facts which, when ollected, produce on the mind the conviction that the diminuion in numbers, and the decline in civilisation of the Greek ace, were the effect of the oppression and injustice of the Roman government, not of the violence and cruelty of the arbarian invaders of the empire. During the reign of that nsane tyrant Justinian II., the imperial troops, when properly ommanded, showed that the remains of Roman discipline nabled them to defeat all their enemies in a fair field of attle. The emperor Leontius, and Heraclius the brother of Tiberius Apsimar, were completely victorious over the reoubted Saracens; Justinian himself defeated the Bulgarians nd Sclavonians. But the whole power of the empire was ithdrawn from the people to be concentrated in the governent. The Greek municipal guards had been carefully deprived of their arms under Justinian I., whose timid policy egarded internal rebellion as far more to be dreaded than oreign invasions. The people were everywhere disarmed beause their hostile feelings were known and feared. The European Greeks were regarded as provincials just as much as he wild Lycaonians or Isaurians; and if they anywhere succeeded in obtaining arms and resisting the progress of the clavonians, they owed their success to the weakness and eglect which, in all despotic governments, prevent the strict xecution of those laws which are at variance with the feelings nd interests of the population, the moment that the agents of he government can derive no direct profit from enforcing hem.

The Roman government always threw the greatest difficulties in the way of their subjects' acquiring the means of efending themselves without the aid of the imperial army. The injury Justinian inflicted on the Greek cities by disbandng their local militia, and robbing them of the municipal unds devoted to preserve their physical well-being and ental culture, caused a deep-rooted hatred of the imperial

1 *Excerpta e Menandri Hist.* p. 313, edit. Bonn. Theophanes, *Chron.* 367. The agaudæ in Spain and Gaul were a similar race of outlaws.—Ducange, *Gloss. Med. et fra Lat.*, in voce. In the time of Gallienus, Sicily was ravaged by armies of igands.—*Script. Aug.* Trebell. Poll. c. 4. In the reign of Arcadius, bands of slaves the dress of Huns plundered Thrace.—Zosimus, v. 22. The frequent portents of inrrections of slaves and ravages of brigands, indicated by Lydus, proved that men ed in constant fear of these calamities during the sixth century.—*De Ostentis*, xxxiv. 15, 25.

government. This feeling is well portrayed in the bitte satire of the "Secret History" of Procopius. The hatre between the inhabitants of Hellas and the Roman Greek connected with the imperial administration soon becam mutual; and at last a term of contempt is used by the his torians of the Byzantine empire to distinguish the nativ Greeks from the other Greek inhabitants of the empire,—the were called Helladikoi.

After the time of Justinian we possess little authentic in formation concerning the details of the provincial and mun cipal administration of the Greek population. The state o public roads and buildings, of ports, of trade, of maritim communications; of the nature of the judicial, civil, and police administration, and of the extent of education among the people—in short, the state of all those things which powerfully influence the character and the prosperity of nation, are almost unknown. It is certain that they were al in a declining and neglected state. Thessalonica, though situated in one of the richest provinces of Europe, was ofte reduced to great distress by famine, and unfortunately thes famines arose in as great a degree from the fiscal regulation and commercial monopolies of the Roman government, a from the devastations of the barbarians.[1] The local adminis tration of the Greek cities still retained some shadow o ancient forms, and senates existed in many, even to a late period of the Byzantine empire. Indeed, they must all have enjoyed very much the same form of government as Venice and Amalfi, at the period when these cities first began t enjoy a virtual independence.

The absence of all national feeling, which had ever been a distinguishing feature of the Roman government, continued t exert its influence at the court of Constantinople long afte the Greeks formed the bulk of the population of the empire This spirit separated the governing classes from the people and induced all those who obtained employments in the service of the State to constitute themselves into a body directly opposed to Greek nationality, because the Greeks formed the great mass of the governed. The election o many emperors not of Greek blood at this period must be attributed to the strength of this feeling.[2] This opposition

[1] Tafel, *Thessalonica*, p. lxvii.

[2] Heraclius was a Roman of Africa; Leontius was an Isaurian (Niceph. Pat. 25) Leo, an Isaurian (see Theophanes, *Ch.* 300; Lebeau, xii. 93, 97). Philippicus and

etween the Greek people and the imperial administration ontributed, in a considerable degree, to revive the authority f the Eastern Church. The church was peculiarly Greek; ndeed, so much so, that an admixture of foreign blood was enerally regarded as almost equivalent to a taint of heresy. s the priests were chosen from every rank of society, the hole Greek nation was usually interested in the prosperity nd passions of the church. In learning and moral character, ne higher clergy were far superior to the rest of the aristocracy, nd thus they possessed a moral influence capable of protect- ng their friends and adherents among the people, in many uestions with the civil government. This legitimate authority, hich was very great in the civil administration, and was upported by national feelings and prejudices, gave them un- ounded influence, the moment that any dispute ranged the reek clergy and people on the same side in their opposition o the imperial power. The Greek Church appears for a long eriod of history as the only public representative of the eelings and views of the nation, and, after the accession of eo the Isaurian, it must be regarded as an institution which ended to preserve the national existence of the Greeks.

Amidst the numerous vices in the social state of mankind t this period, it is consoling to be able to find a single virtue. he absence of all national feeling in the imperial armies xercised a humane influence on the wars which the empire arried on against the Saracens. It is certain that the religious atred, subsequently so universal between the Christians and Mohammedans, was not very violent in the seventh and ighth centuries. The facility with which the orthodox atriarchs of Jerusalem and of Alexandria submitted to the overnment of the Mohammedans has been already men- oned. The empire, it is true, was generally the loser by his want of national and patriotic feeling among the Chris- ans; but, on the other hand, the gain to humanity was im- ense, as is proved by the liberality of Moawyah, who rebuilt ne church of Edessa. The Arabs for some time continued o be guided by the sentiments of justice which Mahomet ad carefully inculcated, and their treatment of their heretic ubjects was far from oppressive, in a religious point of view. When Abdalmelik desired to convert the splendid church of

eo V. were Armenians; Nicephorus was of Arabian descent (Abou'lfaradj, 139). ichael II., of Amorium, was said to be a Jew (Cedrenus, *H. C.* 2, 496); he was robably of Phrygian race.

Damascus into a mosque, he abstained, on finding that th Christians of Damascus were entitled to keep possession of i by the terms of their original capitulation. The insults whic Justinian II. and the caliph Walid respectively offered to th religion of his rival, were rather the effect of personal in solence and tyranny, than of any sentiment of religious bigotr Justinian quarrelled with Abdalmelik, on account of the ordi nary superscription of the caliph's letters—"Say there is on God, and that Mahomet is his prophet." Walid violently ex pelled the Christians from the great church of Damascus, an converted it into a mosque. At this period, any connectio of Roman subjects with the Saracens was viewed as ordinar treason, and not as subsequently in the time of the Crusades in the light of an inexpiable act of sacrilege. Even the accu sation brought against the Pope, Martin, of correspondin with the Saracens, does not appear to have been made wit the intention of charging him with blacker treason than tha which resulted from his supporting the rebel exarch Olympius All rebels who found their enterprise desperate, naturall sought assistance from the Saracens, as the most powerfu enemies of the empire. The Armenian, Mizizius, who wa proclaimed emperor at Syracuse, after the murder of Con stans II., applied to the Saracens for aid. The Armenian Christians continually changed sides between the emperor and the caliph, as the alliance of each appeared to afford them the fairest hopes of serving their political and religious interests. But as the Greek nation became more and more identified with the political interests of the church, and as barbarism and ignorance spread more widely among the popu lation of the Byzantine and Arabian empires, the feelings o mutual hatred became daily more violent.

The government of the Roman empire had long been despotic and weak, and the financial administration corrupt and oppressive; but still its subjects enjoyed a benefit of which the rest of mankind were almost entirely destitute, in the existence of an admirable code of laws, and a complete judicial establishment, separated from the other branches of the public administration. It is to the existence of this judicial establishment, guided by a published code of laws, and controlled by a body of lawyers educated in public schools, that the subjects of the empire were chiefly indebted for the superiority in civilisation which they still retained over the rest of the world. In spite of the neglect displayed in the

ther branches of the administration, the central government lways devoted particular care to the dispensation of justice n private cases, as the surest means of maintaining its uthority, and securing its power, against the evil effects of its scal extortions. The profession of the law continued to orm an independent body, in which learning and reputation ere a surer means of arriving at wealth and honour than the rotection of the great; for the government itself was, from nterest, generally induced to select the ablest members of the gal profession for judicial offices. The existence of the legal rofession, uniting together a numerous body of educated nen, guided by the same general views, and connected by milar studies, habits of thought, and interests, must have iven the lawyers an independence both of character and osition, which, when they were removed from the immediate nfluence of the court, could not fail to operate as some check n the arbitrary abuse of administrative and fiscal power.

In all countries which exist for any length of time in a ate of civilisation, a number of local, communal, and unicipal institutions are created, which really perform a conderable portion of the duties of civil government; for no entral administration can carry its control into every detail; nd those governments which attempt to carry their interference rthest are generally observed to be those which leave most f the real work of government undone. During the greater eriod of the Roman domination, the Greeks had been llowed to retain their own municipal and provincial instituons, as has been stated in the earlier part of this work, and ne details of the civil administration were left almost entirely n their hands. Justinian I. destroyed this system as far as lay n his power; and the effects of the unprotected condition of ne Greek population have been seen in the facilities which ere afforded to the ravages of the Avars and Sclavonians. s the empire grew weaker, and the danger from the barbarians ore imminent, the imperial regulations could not be regarded. Unless the Greeks had obtained the right of bearing arms, heir towns and villages must have fallen a prey to every assing band of brigands, and their commerce would have een annihilated by Sclavonian and Saracen cruisers. The nhabitants of Venice, Istria, and Dalmatia, the citizens of aëta, Capua, Naples, and Salerno, and the inhabitants of ontinental Greece, the Peloponnesus, and the Archipelago, ould have been exterminated by their barbarous neighbours,

unless they had possessed not only arms which they were ab and willing to use, but also a municipal form of local a ministration capable of directing the energies of the peop without consulting the central government at Constantinopl The possession of arms, and the government of a nativ magistracy, gradually revived the spirit of independence; an to these circumstances must be traced the revival of th wealth of the Greek islands, and of the commercial cities the Peloponnesus. Many patriotic Greeks may possibly hav lived brooding over the sufferings of their country in th monasteries, whose number was one of the greatest social evi of the time; and the furious monks, who frequently issue from their retirement to insult the imperial authority unde some religious watchword, were often inspired by politica and national resentments which they could not avow.

Although the period of history which has been treated i this work has brought down the record of events to the fina destruction of ancient political society in the Eastern Empire still the reader must carefully bear in mind that the chang had not, in the seventh and eighth centuries, completel changed the external appearance of the ancient cities of th empire. Though the wealth and the numbers of the inhab tants had diminished, most of the public buildings of th ancient Greeks existed in all their splendour, and it would b a very incorrect picture indeed of a Greek city of this period to suppose that it resembled in any way the filthy and ill constructed burghs of the middle ages.[1] The solid fortifica tions of ancient military architecture still defended man cities against the assaults of the Sclavonians, Bulgarians, an Saracens; the splendid monuments of ancient art were stil preserved in all their brilliancy, though unheeded by the passer-by; the agoras were frequented, though by a less numerous and less busy population; the ancient courts o justice were still in use, and the temples of Athens had yet sustained no injury from time, and little from neglect. The enmity of the iconoclasts to picture-worship, which, as Colonel Leake justly remarks,[2] has been the theme for much exaggera-

[1] Some fine statues were found in the ruins of Eclana, a town near Beneventum which was destroyed by Constans II. (A.D. 663). They were conveyed to Spain.—Lebeau, xi. 387.

[2] *Topography of Athens and the Demi*, vol. i. p. 65. I am not quite sure that "it was about the age of the iconoclastic dispute that the productions of ancient sculpture finally disappeared from every part of the ancient world, with the sole exception of the Byzantine capital." They appear, from the position in which monuments are often found, to have been preserved untouched to a much later period, and it seems probable

on, had not yet caused the destruction of the statues and aintings of pure Grecian art. The classical student, with ausanias in his hand, might unquestionably have identified very ancient site noticed by that author in his travels, and iewed the greater part of the buildings which he describes. n many of the smaller cities of Greece it is doubtless true nat the barbarians had left dreadful marks of their severity. When imperial vanity could be gratified by the destruction of ncient works of art, or when the value of their materials nade them an object of cupidity, the finest masterpieces of culpture were exposed to ruin. The emperor Anastasius I. ermitted the finest bronze statues, which Constantine had ollected from all the cities of Greece, to be melted into a olossal image of himself.[1] During the reign of Constans II., ne bronze tiles of the Pantheon of Rome were taken away. et new statues continued to be erected to the emperors in ne last days of the empire. A colossal statue of bronze, tributed to the emperor Heraclius, existed at Barletta, in pulia, as late as the fourteenth century.[2] That the Greeks ad not yet ceased entirely to set some value on art, is proved y the well-executed cameos and intaglios, and the existing nosaics, which cannot be attributed to an earlier period. et no more barbarous coinage ever circulated than that hich issued from the mint of Constantinople during the rly part of the seventh century. The soul of art, indeed, nat public feeling which inspires correct taste, was extinct, nd the excellence of execution still existing was only the sult of mechanical dexterity, and apt imitation of good nodels.

The destinies of literature were very similar to those of t; nothing was now understood but what was directly connected with practical utility; but the memory of the ancient riters was still respected, and the cultivation of literature ill conferred a high degree of reputation. Learning was either neglected nor despised, though its objects were sadly misunderstood, and its pursuits confined to a small circle of otaries. The learned institutions, the libraries, and the niversities of Alexandria, Antioch, Berytus, and Nisibis, ere destroyed; but at Athens, Thessalonica, and Constantinople, literature and science were not utterly neglected;

at they only then began to be exposed to destruction for the use of the materials of nich they were composed.

[1] Malalas, xvi. 42, edit. Venet.

[2] Visconti, *Icon. Rom.* iv. 165.

public libraries and all the conveniences for a life of study still existed. Many towns must have contained individuals who solaced their hours by the use of these libraries; and although poverty, the difficulties of communication, and declining taste, daily circumscribed the numbers of the learned, there can be no doubt that they were never without some influence on society. Their habits of life and the love of retirement, which a knowledge of the past state of their country tended to nourish, certainly inclined this class rather to conceal themselves from public notice, than to intrude on the attention of their countrymen. The principal Greek poet who flourished during the latter years of the Roman empire, and whose writings have been preserved, is George Pisida, the author of three poems in iambic verses on the exploits of Heraclius, written in the seventh century. It would perhaps be difficult, in the whole range of literature, to point to a poetry which conveys less information on the subject which he pretends to celebrate, than that of George Pisida. In taste and poetical inspiration, he is quite as deficient as in judgment, and he displays no trace of any national character.[1] The historical literature of the period is certainly superior to the poetical in merit, for though most of the writers offer little to praise in their style, still much that is curious and valuable is preserved in the portion of their writings which we possess. The fragments of the historian Menander of Constantinople, written about the commencement of the seventh century, make us regret the loss of his entire works. From these fragments we derive much valuable information concerning the state of the empire, and his literary merit is by no means contemptible.[2] The most important work relating to this period is the general history of Theophylactus Simocatta, who wrote in the earlier part of the seventh century. His work contains a great deal of curious information, evidently collected with considerable industry: but, as Gibbon remarks, he is harmless of taste or genius, and these deficiencies lead him to mistake the relative importance of historical facts.[3] He is supposed to have been of Egyptian origin.

[1] The best edition is that of Bekker, in the collection of the Byzantine historians, now publishing at Bonn. It is included in the same volume as Anas Silentiarius and the patriarch Nicephorus. The two poets deserved an index, for nobody is likely to peruse them for amusement.

[2] The fragments of Menander are contained in the first volume of the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians, a volume valuable to those who may feel little interest in the greater part of the collection.

[3] *Decline and Fall*, ch. xlvi. notes 34, 55.

Two chronological writers, John Malalas, and the author f the "Chronicon Paschale," likewise deserve notice, as they upply valuable and authentic testimony as to many impor- ant events. The many curious notices concerning earth- uakes, inundations, fires, plagues, and prodigies, which ppear in the Byzantine chronicles, afford strong ground for nferring that something like our modern newspapers must ave been published even in the latter days of the empire. he only ecclesiastical historian who belongs to this period Evagrius, whose church history extends from A.D. 429 to 93. In literary merit he is inferior to the civil historians, ut his work has preserved many facts which would other- ise have been lost. The greater number of the literary and cientific productions of this age are not deserving of parti- ular notice. Few, even of the most learned and industrious cholars, consider that an acquaintance with the pages of hose whose writings are preserved, is of more importance han a knowledge of the names of those whose works are ost.[1] The discovery of paper, which Gibbon says came from amarcand to Mecca about 710, seems to have contributed uite as much to multiply worthless books as to preserve the ost valuable ancient classics. By rendering the materials f writing more accessible in an age destitute of taste, and evoted to ecclesiastical and theological disputation, it nnounced the arrival of the stream of improvement in a eluge of muddy pedantry and dark stupidity.

The mighty change which had taken place in the influence f Greek literature since the time of the Macedonian con- uest deserves attention. All the most valuable monuments f its excellence were preserved, and time had in no way iminished their value. But the mental supremacy of the reeks had, nevertheless, received a far severer shock than heir political power; and there was far less hope of their ecovering from the blow, since they were themselves the real uthors of their literary degeneracy, and the sole admirers of he inflated vanity which had become their national character- tic.[2] The admitted superiority of Greek authors in taste nd truth, those universal passports to admiration, had once nduced a number of writers of foreign race to aspire to fame

1 For information on Greek literary history, see Fabricii, *Bibliotheca Græca*, edit. arless. Hamb. 1790, &c. Schoell, *Histoire de la Litterature Grecque Profane*, &c., aris, 1823: or the improved German translation by Dr. Pinder. Petersen, *Handbuch r Griechischen Litteratur Geschichte*. Hamb. 1834.

2 Dion. Chrysostomus, *Or.* 38. Ἑλληνικὰ ἁμαρτήματα.

by writing in Greek; and this happened not only during th period of the Macedonian domination, but also under th Roman empire, after the Greeks had lost all political suprem acy, when Latin was the official language of the civilise world, and the dialects of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, po sessed a civil and scientific, as well as an ecclesiastica literature. The Greeks forfeited this high position by the inordinate self-adulation. This feeling kept their minc stationary, while the rest of mankind was moving forwar Even when they embraced Christianity they could not la aside the trammels of a state of society which they ha repudiated; they retained so many of their old vices tha they soon corrupted Christianity into Greek orthodoxy.

The position of the Greeks was completely changed by th conquests of the Arabs. At Alexandria, in Syria, and Cyren aïca, they soon became extinct; and that portion of thei literature which still retained a value in the eyes of mankin came to be viewed in a totally different light. The Arabs c the eighth century undoubtedly regarded the scientific litera ture of the Greeks with great respect, but they considered i only as a mine from which to extract a useful metal. Th study of the Greek language was no longer a matter of th slightest importance, for the learned Arabians were satisfie if they could master the results of science by the translation of their Syrian subjects. It has been said that Arabic ha held the rank of an universal language as well as Greek, bu the fact must be admitted only in the restricted sense o applying it to their extensive empire. The different range o the mental and moral power of the literatures of Arabia of Rome, and of Greece, is only, in our age, becoming fully apparent.

There is no country in the world more directly dependen on commerce for the well-being of its inhabitants than the land occupied by the Greeks round the Ægean Sea. Nature has separated these territories by mountains and seas into a variety of districts, whose productions are so different, tha unless commerce afford great facilities for exchanging the surplus of each, the population must remain comparatively small, and must languish in a state of poverty and privation.

The Greeks still possessed the greater share of that commerce which they had for ages enjoyed in the Medi terranean. The conquest of Alexandria and Carthage un doubtedly gave it a severe blow, and the existence of a

merous maritime population in Syria, Egypt, and Africa, abled the Arabs to share the profits of a trade which had therto been a monopoly of the Greeks. The absolute vernment of the caliphs, their jealousy of their Christian bjects, and the civil wars which so often laid waste their minions, rendered property too insecure in their dominions r commerce to flourish with the same tranquillity which it joyed under the legal despotism of the Eastern emperors; r commerce cannot long exist without a systematic adminis-ation, and soon declines, if its natural course be at all terrupted.

The wealth of Syria at the time of its conquest by the abs proves that the commerce of the trading cities of the oman empire was still considerable. A caravan, consisting four hundred loads of silk and sugar was on its way to albec at the time the place was attacked. Extensive manu-ctories of silk and dye-stuffs flourished, and several great irs assisted in circulating the various commodities of the d through the different provinces.[1] The establishment of st-horses was at first neglected by the Arabs, but it was soon rceived to be so essential to the prosperity of the country, at it was restored by the caliph Moawyah. The Syrian cities ntinued, under the Saracen government, to retain their alth and trade as long as their municipal rights were spected. No more remarkable proof of this fact need be duced, than the circumstance of the local mints supplying e whole currency of the country until the year 695, when e Sultan Abdalmelik first established a national gold and ver coinage.[2]

Even the Arabian conquests were insufficient to deprive the pire of the great share which it held in the Indian trade. hough the Greeks lost all direct political control over it, y still retained possession of the carrying trade of the south Europe; and the Indian commodities destined for that rket passed almost entirely through their hands. The abs, in spite of the various expeditions which they fitted out attack Constantinople, never succeeded in forming a ritime power; and their naval strength declined with the mbers and wealth of their Christian subjects, until it

[1] Ockley, i. 166.

[2] Saulcy, *Lettres à M. Reinaud*, Membre de l'Institut, sur quelques points de la nismatique Arabe. Curt Bose, *Ueber Arabische Byzantin'sche Münzen*. Grunina,).

dwindled into a few piratical squadrons.[1] The emperors Constantinople really remained the masters of the sea, an subjects the their inheritors of the riches which its commer affords.[2]

The principal trade of the Greeks, after the Arabian co quests, consisted of three branches,—the Mediterranea trade with the nations of Western Europe, the home trad and the Black Sea trade. The state of society in the sou of Europe was still so disordered, in consequence of the settl ments of the barbarians, that the trade for supplying the with Indian commodities and the manufactures of the Ea was entirely in the hands of the Jews and Greeks, and con merce solely in that of the Greeks. The consumption spices and incense was then enormous; a large quantity spice was employed at the tables of the rich, and Christia burned incense daily in their churches. The wealth engage in carrying on this traffic belonged chiefly to the Greek and although the Arabs, after they had rendered themselv masters of the two principal channels of the Indian trad through Persia and Syria, and by the Red Sea and Egyp contrived to participate in its profits, the Greeks still reg lated the trade by the command of the northern route throug central Asia to the Black Sea. The consumption of India productions was generally too small at any particular port admit of whole cargoes forming the staple of a direct con merce with the West. The Greeks rendered this traffic pr fitable, from the facility with which they could prepare mixe cargoes by adding the fruit, oil, and wine of their native pr vinces, and the produce of their own industry; for they we then the principal manufacturers of silk, dyed woollen fabric jewellery, arms, rich dresses, and ornaments. The importanc of this trade was one of the principal causes which enable the Roman empire to retain the conquests of Justinian i Spain and Sardinia, and this commercial influence of th Greek nation checked the power of the Goths, the Lombard and the Avars, and gained for them as many allies as th avarice and tyranny of the exarchs and imperial officer created enemies. It may not be superfluous to remark, tha the invectives against the government and persons of th

[1] Compare Theophanes, *Ch.* 332, and *Scriptores post Theoph.* 46.

[2] Τὸ *τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θαλασσοκρατεῖν μέχρι τῶ Ηρακλέους στηλῶν καὶ πασῆς ὁμοῦ τῆς ὧδε θαλασσης.*"—Constant. Porphyr. *Them.* p. 58, edit. Bonn.

archs which abound in the works of the Italians, and from em have been copied into the historians of Western Europe, ust always be sifted with care, as they are the outbreaks of e violent political aversion of the Latin ecclesiastics to the thority of the Eastern Empire, not an echo of the general inion of society. The people of Rome, Venice, Genoa, ples, and Amalfi, clung to the Roman empire from feelings interest, long after they possessed the power of assuming rfect independence. These feelings of interest arose from e commercial connection of the West and East. The lians did not yet possess capital sufficient to carry on the stern trade without the assistance of the Greeks. The urn cargoes from the north consisted chiefly of slaves, wood building, raw materials of various kinds, and provisions the maritime districts.[1]

The most important branch of trade, in a large empire, ust ever be that which is carried on within its own territory, the advantage of its subjects. The peculiar circumstances ve been noticed that make the prosperity of the inhabitants those countries which are inhabited by the Greek race entially dependent on commerce.[2] The internal commerce, it had been left unfettered by restrictions, would probably ve saved the Roman empire; but the financial difficulties, used by the lavish expenditure of Justinian I., induced that peror to invent a system of monopolies,[3] which ultimately ew the trade of the empire into the hands of the free izens of Venice and Amalfi, whom it had compelled to ume independence. Silk, oil, various manufactures, and n grain, were made the subject of monopolies, and tem- ary restrictions were at times laid on particular branches trade for the profit of favoured individuals.[4] The traffic in in between the different provinces of the empire was sub- ted to onerous, and often arbitrary arrangements;[5] and the iculties which nature had opposed to the circulation of the essaries of life, as an incentive to human industry, were reased, and the inequalities of price augmented for the

Constant. Porph. *De Cær. Aulæ Byz.* l. i. c. 72; vol. i. p. 363, edit. Bonn. stasius, *De Vitis Pont. Rom.* p. 79. The Venetians, in 960, were forbidden by Pope to export Christian slaves to sell them to the Saracens.

The ancient prosperity of Greece is shown in the existence of numerous small is celebrated for their manufactures. Thus the purple dye of Melibœa, a little on Mount Ossa.—Lucretius, 2, 499. Virgil, *Æn.* 5, 251. Leake's *Travels in thern Greece*, iii. 388.

Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* c. 25, where particular mention is made of a monopoly of at Berytus and Tyre.

Leo Gramm. *Chron.* p. 477. A.D. 888. [5] Procop. *Hist. Arc.* c. 22, p. 64.

profit of the treasury or the gain of the fiscal officers, un industry was destroyed by the burden.[1]

These monopolies, and the administration which supporte them, were naturally odious to the mercantile classes. Whe it became necessary, in order to retain the Mediterranea trade, to violate the great principle of the empire, that th subjects should not be intrusted with arms, nor fit out arme vessels to carry on distant commerce, these armed vesse whenever they were able to do so with impunity, violated th monopolies and fiscal regulations of the emperors. The indi pendence of the Italian and Dalmatian cities then became condition of their commercial prosperity. There can be litt doubt, that if the Greek commercial classes had been able escape the superintendence of the imperial administration easily as the Italians, they, too, would have asserted thei independence; for the emperors of Constantinople nev viewed the merchants of their dominions in any other ligh than as a class from whom money was to be obtained in ever possible way.[2] This view is common in all absolute gover ments. An instinctive aversion to the independent positio of the commercial classes, joined to a contempt for trad usually suggests such measures as eventually drive commerc from countries under despotic rule. The little republics Greece, the free cities of the Syrian coast, Carthage, the r publics of Italy, the Hanse towns, Holland, England, an America, all illustrate by their history how much trade dependent on those free institutions which offer a securit against financial oppression; while the Roman empire afford an instructive lesson of the converse.

The trade of Constantinople with the countries round th Black Sea, was an important element in the commerci prosperity of the empire. Byzantium served as the entrepo of this commerce, and the traffic to the south of the Helle pont, even before it became the capital of the Roman empire After that event, its commerce was as much augmented as it population. It was supplied with a tribute of grain fro Egypt, and of cattle from the Tauric Chersonese, which kep provisions generally at a low price, and made it the seat of flourishing manufacturing industry.[4] The commerce of th

[1] *Digest.* l. 50, tit. 5, *De vacat. et excusat. Munerum*, l. c. *De Negotiatoribus Frumentariis.*
[2] Procop. *Hist. Arc.* c. 25.
[3] Polybius, *Hist.* iv. sect. 38, 4; vol. ii. p. 55, edit. Tauch.
[4] Cedrenus, 367. Theophanes, *Chron.* p. 140. Constant. Porph. *De Adm. Imp.* c.

ountries to the north of the Black Sea, the fur and the ndian trade, by the Caspian, the Oxus, and the Indus, entred at Constantinople, whence the merchants distributed ie various articles they imported among the nations of the Vest, and received in exchange the productions of these ountries. The great value of this commerce, even to the rbarous nations which obtained a share in it, is frequently entioned by the Byzantine historians. The Avars had ofited greatly by this traffic, and the decline of their npire was attributed to its decay; though there can be little ubt that the real cause, both of the decline of the trade id of the Avar power, arose from the insecurity of property, iginating in bad government.[1] The wealth of the mercan- e and manufacturing classes in Constantinople contributed, no small degree, to the success with which that city repulsed e attacks of the Avars and the Saracens.

Nothing could tend more to give us a correct idea of the al position of the Greek nation at the commencement of e eighth century, than a view of the moral condition of the wer orders of the people; but, unfortunately, all materials, en for a cursory inquiry into this subject, are wanting. The w casual notices which can be gleaned from the lives of the ints, afford the only authentic evidence of popular feeling. cannot, however, escape notice, that even the shock which e Mohammedan conquests had given to the orthodox church, d failed to recall its ministers back to their real duty of in- lcating the pure principles of the Christian religion. They ntinued their old practice of confounding the intellects of eir congregations, by propagating a belief in false miracles, d by discussing the unintelligible distinctions of scholastic eology. From the manner in which religion was treated by e Eastern clergy, the people could profit little from the stories of imaginary saints, and understand nothing of the ctrines which they were instructed to consider as the sence of their religion. The consequence was, that they gan to fall back on the idle traditions of their ancestors, d to blend the last recollections of paganism with w superstitions, derived from a perverted application of e consolations of Christianity. Relics of pagan usages re retained; a belief that the spirits of the dead haunted e paths of the living, was general in all ranks; a respect for e bones of martyrs, and a confidence in the figures on

1 Suidas, v. Βούλγαροι.—Vol i. 1017, edit. Bernhardy.

amulets, became the real doctrines of the popular faith. Th connection which existed between the clergy and the peop powerful and great as it really was, appears at bottom to ha been based on social and political grounds. Pure religi was so rare, that the word only served as a pretext for creasing the power of the clergy, who appear to have found easier to make use of the superstitions of the people than their religious and moral feelings. The ignorant condition the lower orders, and particularly of the rural population, e plains the curious fact, that paganism continued to exist in t mountains of Greece as late as the reign of the emperor Ba (A.D. 867–886), when the Maniates of Mount Taygetus we at last converted to Christianity.[1]

It has often been asserted, that about this time continent Greece, the Peloponnesus, and the islands of the Archipelag were reduced to such a state of destitution and barbaris because they are only mentioned by historians as places banishment for criminals.[2] But this mode of announcing t fact, that many persons of rank were exiled to the cities Greece, leaves an incorrect impression on the mind of th reader, for the most flourishing cities of the East were oft selected as the places best adapted for the safe custody political prisoners. We know from Constantine Porphyr genitus that Cherson was a powerful commercial city, who alliance or enmity was of considerable importance to th Byzantine empire, even so late as the tenth century.[3] Y this city was often selected as a place of banishment f persons of high rank, who were regarded as dangerous sta criminals. Pope Martin was banished thither by Constans II and it was the place of exile of the emperor Justinian I The emperor Philippicus, before he ascended the throne, ha been exiled by Tiberius Apsimar to Cephallenia, and b Justinian II. to Cherson, a circumstance which would lead t to infer that a residence in the islands of Greece was co sidered a more agreeable sojourn than that of Cherso Several of the adherents of Philippicus were, after his d thronement, banished to Thessalonica, one of the richest an most populous cities of the empire.[4]

The command of the imperial troops in Greece was co

[1] Constant. Porphyr. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 50; vol. iii. 224, edit. Bonn.
[2] Gibbon, ch. xlviii.; vol. vi. 78, 85, Smith's edit. Emerson's *History of Mode Greece*, i. 56.
[3] Const. Porph. *De Adm. Imp.* c. 53; vol. iii. 269, edit. Bonn.
[4] Theophanes, *Chron.* 321.

lered an office of high rank, and it was accordingly conferred Leontius, when Justinian II. wished to persuade that neral that he was restored to favour. Leontius made it the pping-stone to the throne. But the strongest proof of the alth and prosperity of the cities of Greece, is to be found in e circumstance of their being able to fit out the expedition ich ventured to attempt wresting Constantinople from the asp of a soldier and statesman, such as Leo the Isaurian was own to be, at the time when the Greeks deliberately resolved overturn his throne.[1]

It is difficult to form any correct representation of a state society so different from our own, as that which existed ong the Greeks in the eighth century. The rural districts, the one hand, were reduced to a state of desolation, and e towns, on the other, flourished in wealth; agriculture was the lowest ebb, while trade was in a prosperous condition. however, we look forward to the long series of misfortunes ich were required to bring this favoured land to the state of mplete destitution to which it sank at a later period, we may rive at a more accurate knowledge of its condition, in the rly part of the eighth century, than would be possible were to confine our view to looking back at the records of its cient splendour, and to comparing a few lines in the meagre ronicles of the Byzantine writers with the volumes of rlier history recounting the greatest actions with unrivalled gance.

[1] See *Byzantine Empire*, i. 43.

APPENDIX

I

ON THE BLINDNESS OF BELISARIUS[1]

ORD MAHON, in his *Life of Belisarius*, published in 1829, has ndeavoured to set aside the verdict of historians concerning the indness of Belisarius, which Ducange, Gibbon, Lebeau, and linton pronounce to be an invention of later times. Undoubtedly, ither the critical sagacity nor the profound knowledge of these minent writers ought to command our assent, if historical evidence ould be produced with which they were not acquainted. Lord ahon cites what he considers a new authority on the subject. He ints out that the blindness of Belisarius is mentioned as early as e latter part of the eleventh century in an anonymous writer who as left a description of Constantinople.[2] This guide-book was ritten more than five hundred years after the death of the nperor Justinian; and unless its authority be quite free from ubt, it can hardly be considered as more valuable testimony on a int of Roman history than a London guide-book, written in 29, would be concerning the garter of Lady Salisbury. The ssage in question informs us that Justinian, from envy (and not, history says, because Belisarius was accused of being privy to a nspiracy against the emperor), ordered the eyes of his general- simo Belisarius to be put out, and stationed him in the Laurus, th a bowl of earthenware in his hand, that passers-by might ss him an obolus. It seems probable that both Gibbon and Le- au had not overlooked this passage, though they make no usion to it; for they must have considered it refuted by the marks bears of being taken from a tale illustrating the vicissitudes of tune and the ingratitude of princes, and not from historical thority. Besides, they probably observed that it was quite incon- tent with a fact mentioned a few lines farther down on the same ge, and for which the guide-book was an excellent authority— mely, that there was still standing near the palace of Chalke a ded statue of Belisarius beside a statue of the emperor Justin and a cross erected by Justinian. Now, in the case of a con- mned traitor, the first act was to throw down his statues; and if lisarius had been treated with extreme indignity, his statue would t have been allowed to retain a place of singular honour. The sition of this statue indicates that it was a dedication of Justi-

[1] See p. 243.

[2] This work is ascribed to Michael Psellus, the prince of the philosophers.

nian in the early part of his reign. Belisarius left no posterity, an his exploits were not likely to receive any public testimony gratitude from the successors of Justinian, who soon lost the pr vinces which had been reunited to the empire by his victorie The anonymous writer also, near the end of his work, mentio that Justinian, in order to honour his victorious general, ordered medal to be struck, having on the reverse a figure of Belisari armed with the inscription, "Belisarius the glory of the Romans but that envy as usual assailed him in his prosperity, and he w removed from his command. Here no allusion is made to h having been punished with the loss of his eyes.

It is not easy to fix the period at which the tale of the blindne of Belisarius obtained general currency, in company probably wi the secret histories of the court and the lives of the saints; but th edition seen by the anonymous guide was probably not so old the latter part of the ninth century. A historical event somewh similar in circumstances is described by several writers of chron cles in nearly similar words; and the punishment of Symbatic who rebelled against Michael III. (the Drunkard) in the year 86 appears to have served as the foundation for the tale of Belisariu

The words of the guide-book are: Ὁς (Ἰουστινιανὸς) ὕστερ φθονήσας τῷ ῥηθέντι στρατηγικωτά τῳ Βελισαρίῳ ἐξώρυξε τοὑτου το ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ προσέταξε τούτον καθεσθῆναι εἰς τὰ Λαύρου καὶ ἐπιδοῦναι αὐ σκεῦος ὀστράκινον καὶ ἐπιῤῥίπτειν αὐτῷ τοὺς διερχομένους ὀβολόν.[1]

The chronicles of the tenth century say: Καὶ ἀποτυφλοῖ Συμβατίου τὸν ἕνα ὀφθαλμον, καὶ ἐκκόπτουσι καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ χεῖρ καὶ ἐκό θισαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ Λαύσου καὶ δεδώκασι σκεῦος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτ ἵνα δς ἔχῃ προαίρεσιν ἐπιῤῥίπτῃ αὐτῷ τί.[2]

The guide-book would, in any case, require to be corroborate by other evidence before it can be admitted as evidence of doubtful fact in the sixth century. Lord Mahon attempts supply confirmatory evidence by depreciating the authority Theophanes, and magnifying the value of John Tzetzes. Now Theophanes may be, as Gibbon calls him, "the father of many lie," for the worthy confessor was credulous as well as pious; b his chronography proves that he had before him many offici documents relating to the sixth and seventh centuries, and he ha used them generally, in spite of some confusion at times, so as t be our best guide on many occasions. Theophanes wrote in th early part of the ninth century, John Tzetzes in the latter part the twelfth, and he is generally considered a writer of very litt authority on any subject. One of his critics observes, very justl that he wrote a great number of verses, making a display of son knowledge of everything but poetry. Besides, there is considerab doubt whether Tzetzes believed the tale of the blindness of Bel sarius which he records, for he admonishes his readers that othe chronicles gave a very different account of the last days of Bel

[1] Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, tom. i. Ant. *Con.* p. 7; compare p. 80.
[2] *Scriptores post Theophanem*, Georg. Mon. 540. Simeon Met. 449. Leo Gramm p. 469, edit. Par.

arius ; that they record that his eyes were not put out, and that he vas restored to his honours. According to every rule of evidence, he testimony of Tzetzes is of less value than that of either Cedrenus, Zonaras, or even Glycas. All these historians confirm he account of Theophanes.

There is an edict in the Corpus Juris Civilis, which would decide ne question if its date and authenticity were firmly established. t is dated in February 565, and was published by Cujacius. In Belisarius is entitled *gloriosissimum Belisarium patricium*. Now, s Theophanes states that Belisarius was restored to his rank and onours in the month of July 563, and that his death occurred in ne month of March 565, this edict would confirm his statement. ut a note in the last edition of the Corpus warns lawyers not to ut implicit faith in its authenticity. "Hoc privilegium editum est n Cujac. obss. sed ex quo fonte desumptum sit, non indicatur, nisi uod Cujacius a P. Galesio Hispano se id accepisse dicat. Non ne ratione addidit Beck qui in app. corporis juris civ. hanc constitutionem recepit, an genuina sit, dubio non carere."[1]

If sound criticism, therefore, must set aside this edict, it must so declare that the guide-book refutes its anonymous author hen he tells us that envy induced Justinian to put out the eyes of elisarius whose statue it described, and it cannot give more eight to one of the statements of John Tzetzes than to the other. onsequently the only historical authority we possess concerning ne last years of Belisarius is Theophanes, who appears to have awn his account of the investigations relating to the conspiracy which Belisarius was implicated from official records.[2]

II

ON ROMAN AND BYZANTINE MONEY

In reviewing the various causes which contributed to the decline the wealth and to the diminution of the population of the oman empire, it is necessary to take into account the depreciation the coinage, which frequently robbed large classes of the industous citizens of great part of their wealth, reduced the amount of operty in the empire, produced confusion in legal contracts, and archy in prices even in the public markets.[3] The evils which ust have resulted from the enormous depreciation of the Roman inage at several periods can only be clearly understood by a ronological record of the principal changes—by remembering at each issue of a depreciated coinage was an act of bankruptcy the part of the reigning emperor—and by observing the ruinous

[1] *Privilegium pro Titionibus*. C. J. C. tom. ii. p. 511, edit. St.
[2] Cedrenus, 387, Zonaras, ii. 69, and Glycas, 267, may be compared with Joannis etzæ *Historiarum Variarum Chiliades*, p. 94, edit. Kiessling, Lip. 1826.
[3] Zosimus, p. 54, edit. Bonn. Speaking of Aurelian's attempt to remedy these evils, says, Τὰ συμβόλαια συγχύσεως ἀπαλλάξας.

effects of similar conduct in modern times in the Othoman empir
Whether the subject of the delinquency of the state be Roma
plated denarii, Turkish pewter piastres, French assignats,
Austrian imperial paper florins, the fraud is the same in its natur
A short account of the principal changes which took place in th
monetary system of the empire will be sufficient to explain th
evil results which they produced on the commerce and industry
the eastern provinces.

From the conquest of Greece to the time of Augustus, bo
Greek and Roman money circulated in the East. Large payment
both of gold and silver, were made by weight. The great di
crepancy in the size of Greek silver coins in circulation rendere
the stamp of each mint merely a certificate of the purity of th
metal; for the drachma of different states varied in the proportic
of 7 to 10; and the Roman denarius was one sixth lighter than th
Attic drachma.[1]

Augustus imposed the Roman monetary system as the offici
standard in financial business for the whole Roman empire. N
mint was allowed to exist without the imperial licence. The pe
mission to coin copper money was, however, conceded to man
Greek local mints, and the privilege of coining silver money wa
granted to several cities; but the only local mint of which gol
coins are known is that of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.[2] Under th
earlier emperors, the money in circulation throughout the Eas
consisted chiefly of Greek and Macedonian coins. Mark Anton
and Augustus, however, appear to have coined a number of piece
of three denarii in Asia Minor, to facilitate the collection of th
taxes in Roman money. After the restrictions placed on the coi
age of silver by the Greek mints, the tribute of the provinces wa
paid in Roman money; and the receivers of the imperial revenue
either compelled the provincials to purchase denarii from th
money-changers, or received payments in Greek money at a rat
which allowed them a profit on the amount of Roman money re
mitted to the imperial treasury.

The Roman coins in circulation from the time of Augustus were
the *aureus*, of which forty were coined from a pound of gold. an
the half aureus; the *denarius*, of which eighty-four were coine
from a pound of silver, and the quinarius or *victoriatus*, which wa
a half denarius.[3] The copper coins were the *sestertius*, weighin
an ounce; the *dupondius*, weighing half-an-ounce; the *as*, whic

[1] Col. Leake's *Numismata Hellencia*. A catalogue of Greek coins is of great valu
from giving the weight of all the Greek silver coins of importance, besides containin
many valuable observations.

[2] Eckhell, *Doctrina Numorum Veterum*, iii. 187. Sabatier (*Production de l'Or, e
l'Argent et du Cuivre, chez les Anciens*, p. 103) gives a list of twenty-five Greek citi
which coined silver under the emperors.

[3] There is great uncertainty concerning the exact weight of the Roman poun
Hussey estimates it at 5204 grains troy; Boeckh, at 5071; Longperier, at 5014. In th
time of Constantine it appears to have been about 5040. It may have been diminishe
at the mint during the six centuries which intervened between the taking of Carist
and the fall of the Western Empire. I have, therefore, assumed the pound after the
time to be 5040 grains.

was nearly equal in size and weight to the dupondius, but was distinguished from it by being coined of red copper, while the sestertius and the dupondius were of a yellow brass.[1] The colour of the metal is not now always apparent through the rust of centuries, but the as is generally of inferior fabric. Sixteen asses were reckoned to the denarius; but in earlier times, as the name indicates, the denarius had been divided into ten asses, and the troops were always paid at that rate. The parts of the *as* in circulation were the *semissis*, or half; the *triens*, or third; and the *quadrans*, or quarter. Examples of all these coins exist; and it would be a great improvement in numismatic works and collections if the coins were arranged under their real denominations, instead of being classed as large, middle, and small brass.

The Greek mints that were licensed by Augustus continued to coin money on the old local standard. There are silver didrachmæ of Nero from the mint of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and drachmæ from that of Ephesus, with these denominations on the coins.[2] But after the time of Nero, the coinage of the Greek mints must have obtained only a limited circulation, as they were issued much under the normal standard, in order to secure a profit to the municipality. Its value was, nevertheless, maintained within the district where it circulated, because it was received in all payments at its nominal rate, not only in the public markets, but by the receivers of municipal taxes, and by the great civil and religious corporations of the place. At the same time, the abundant issue of copper money by many Greek mints must have accelerated the operation of withdrawing silver coin from general circulation. Even Greek local silver coins would soon be at a premium, from the facility of transporting them from one place to another in the neighbourhood when considerable payments were required. The increasing rarity of silver in the Greek cities soon gave rise to the coinage of the large copper pieces, called medallions, which were current for half a drachma, or half a denarius, and which became numerous during the second century. About the same period, the silver coins of Antioch and Cæsarea are debased with a larger proportion of alloy.

The first official step in the deterioration of the Roman coinage was made by Nero. He reduced the size both of the aureus and the denarius by coining 45 aurei from a pound of gold, and 96 denarii from a pound of silver, thereby retaining the proportion of 25 denarii to an aureus; for the relative value of silver to gold was then as 12 to 1. But as Nero coined his silver money below the normal standard, the actual quantity of silver in his denarii made the proportion in his coins as 10.68 to 1.[3] Succeeding emperors increased the quantity of alloy in the denarius; and in the time of Severus (A.D. 193–211), the twenty-five denarii, which were

[1] Pinkerton, *Essay on Medals*, i. 132. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxiv. 2.
[2] Eckhell, vi. 279. Akerman, *Numismatic Manual*, 16.
[3] Mommsen, *Ueber den Verfall des Roemischen Münzwesens in der Kaiserzeit*, 192.

exchanged for an aureus, and which ought, according to th standard, to have contained 1320 grains of pure silver, really co tained only about 670 grains. To this extent the depreciation c the coinage had been carried by the fraudulent conduct of th emperors at the commencement of the third century.

Caracalla in the year 215 made the second great official chang in the standard of the imperial money.[1] He reduced the value c the aureus as well as of the denarius, by coining 50 aurei from pound of gold, and by adding nearly twenty-five per cent of allo to the silver coins. The denarius now weighed only about 50 grain and of these only about 36 grains were of pure silver. Caracall also introduced a new silver coin, the *argenteus Antoninianus*, c 60 to the pound. This became subsequently the principal silve coin of the empire. It is distinguished by the radiated crown c the emperor, and by the bust of the empress being placed on half-moon. This new coin was minted with a large proportion c alloy.[2]

After the time of Caracalla the deterioration of the Roman coinag took place in the most variable and arbitrary manner. Som emperors issued both gold and silver coins greatly deficient i weight and purity, while others returned to the standard c Caracalla, as appears by the existing aurei of Aurelian, Tacitus and Probus. The size of the denarius was retained for a time, i order to facilitate its circulation, at the rate of 25 to an aureus But the proportion of alloy was gradually increased, until th denarius was replaced by the argenteus, which also became at las so depreciated, that it was coined by Gallienus, near the end of hi reign, of a base metal washed over with silver.[3] During the whol period between Caracalla and Gallienus, 25 denarii were reckonec in account as equal to an aureus. But in the reign of Gordian III the denarius had become so depreciated, that the aureus wa exchanged for 25 argentei, and as long as the argenteus containec from 38 to 40 per cent of pure silver, it maintained this course b its real value. After the reign of Philippus, however, it was reduce in size, and depreciated in quality in an irregular manner, so tha

1 That the depreciation by Caracalla was effected in the eighteenth year of hi tribunitian power (A.D. 215) is proved by coins.—De la Nauze, *Mémoires de l'Académi des Inscrip.* xxx. 392.

2 Dio Cassius, 77, 4, mentions the frauds of Caracalla.

3 The proportion of silver in the denarius had fallen to 45½ per cent before the end of Caracalla's reign. It fell lower subsequently.

Under Elagabalus	A.D.	218–222	it was	38.
,, Alex. Severus	,,	222–235	,,	33·5
,, Gordianus III.	,,	238–244	,,	38.

After this time the argenteus replaced the denarius, and the proportion was as follows:—

Under Philippus	A.D.	244–249	it was	42.
,, Trajanus Decius	,,	249–251	,,	34.
,, Valerianus	,,	253–260	,,	35.
,, Gallienus	,,	260–268	,,	38.

But it diminishes, until it at last disappears, and the argenteus becomes a copper coin washed with tin.—Mommsen, 231. Letronne, *Considerations*, 110. Sabatier, *Pondération de l'Or*, 74.

he derangement in the coinage must have produced a constant ariation in the price of gold, and inexplicable confusion in all nonetary transactions. Elagabalus, and even Alexander Severus, ommitted acts of bankruptcy, by issuing debased silver coins, vhich must have ruined innumerable families, and caused incalcul- ble misery. The first lavished money, coined on the legal standard, mong his vicious companions, and paid his debts with debased noney. Even Alexander Severus issued good money to his friends, nd circulated bad among his subjects. Both enforced payment f the public taxes in gold coins of full weight.[1] The depreciation f the coinage in these evil days of Roman history appears to have roceeded with almost as much activity under the best as under he worst of the emperors. Alexander Severus, nevertheless, did ot entirely overlook the bad effects produced by the state of the oinage; and he made some efforts to arrest the depreciation of ie silver coins, by issuing a large quantity of copper sesterces; or as long as the denarius could be exchanged for four sesterces, s value would be maintained as a medium of exchange in small urchases. The number of large brass coins of Alexander Severus nd Gordianus III. which still exist, must be remarked by every erson who has an opportunity of seeing ancient coins. Towards ie end of the reign of Gallienus, however, the deterioration of ie argenteus was carried so far that its metallic value became less an four copper sesterces. The coinage of the sestertius and upondius ceased, and men began to hoard the pieces coined by lexander Severus and Gordianus III. The denarius in circula- on now ceased to be a silver coin, and the denarius of account as merely a monetary denomination for one twenty-fifth of an ureus.

From the accession of Claudius Gothicus, A.D. 268, to that of)iocletian, A.D. 284, there was the greatest disorder in the Roman oinage. The local mints of the Greek cities, one after another, eased to exercise the right of coining money, for they could no nger make a profit by issuing coins on any local standard. The pid impoverishment and consequent depopulation of the provinces, as accelerated by the fiscal proceedings of the emperors. The ebts of the imperial treasury were discharged with tin-washed opper denarii, which were paid at the rate of 25 to an aureus; but hen taxes were exacted, the provincials were compelled to make eir payments in gold, which they were obliged to purchase robably from the agents of the imperial mints) at the rate of 500 525 of the base denarii for an aureus. This fact may afford the udent of history some aid in comprehending the wretched con- tion to which he finds the Roman empire reduced during the tter half of the third century. Another circumstance must have nded to increase the sufferings of the people. During this period, appears that the great officers of the court were paid in good oney, and that the donatives of the emperors were distributed in

[1] Lampridius, "Alex. Sev." 38. Dio Cassius, 72, 16.

gold and silver coins of pure metal, for many such are found
periods when the general currency consisted of base money.[1]

Aurelian (A.D. 270–275) attempted to remedy the disorder in th
coinage, but the short duration of his busy reign prevented hir
from carrying his whole plan into execution. His first object was t
put an end to the continual fluctuations in the price of gold, caused
by the quantity of base money which was issued from the imperia
mint. To effect this with as little injury as possible, he reduce
the base denarii in circulation to the rate at which they thei
circulated, which appears to have been 500 or 525 to an aureu
and he consequently issued from the mint pieces equal to 20 or 2
of these copper denarii as equivalent to a denarius of accoun
The weight of the common copper and plated coins of Aurelia
and his successors, which have XX and XXI in the exergue, varie
from 56 to 66 grains, and consequently from twenty to twenty-on
are equal to four of the large copper coins or sesterces of Alexande
Severus, and Gordianus III.[2] From this time copper money wa
generally used in the markets of the Roman empire, and its pro
portionate value to gold became a matter of importance, as it wa
often employed in large payments.

The reforms of Aurelian reduced the value of the base denar
which Gallienus had put in circulation at the rate of eightpence
before six years had expired, to the value of two-fifths of a penny
He also took away the privilege of coining money from almost a
the local mints of the empire. His reforms deprived the min
masters and the corporations of moneyers of the enormous profit
which they had previously gained by issuing base money an
selling pure gold coins to be used in paying taxes, and probabl
from other iniquitous measures. But from whatever sources th
gains of the mint-masters and the moneyers were derived, it i
certain that their power and wealth were very great, and thei
number considerable; their corporations embraced many familie
in the cities where imperial mints were established, and like othe
artisans in the Roman empire, they were serfs of their corporation
and were compelled to marry only in the families of the corporation
Aurelian's reforms produced an extensive and dangerous revol
of these moneyers; and so great was their animosity against th
imperial reformer, who had sacrificed their profits to the publi
good, that it cost the army seven thousand men before thei
rebellion was suppressed.[4]

[1] Gold medallions exist of Aurelian, Severina, Probus and Carinus, and silver o
Probus, besides quinarii of fine silver of emperors who only coined base denarii.–
Mionnet, *Médailles Romaines*.

[2] The numerals XX, XXI, and XXIU, which are supposed to indicate the value of thes
pieces, are found on coins of the same size and with the same reverses, without any ver
marked difference in weight. Many bear the star, which has been supposed to indicat
the denarius. The XXIU appears first on a coin of Probus.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* x. 19, 15. *Cod Just.* xi. 6, 47. *Cod. Theod.* x. 20, 1, 10. *Cod. Just.* xi
7, 1, 7.

[4] Fl. Vopiscus Aurelianus, 38. Aur. Victor, *De Cæsaribus*. Eutropius, ix. 1
Zosimus, i. 61; p. 54, edit. Bonn.

Diocletian made another great reform in the monetary system f the empire, but the exact date of the change he effected is not nown, nor can all its details be ascertained with precision. From xisting coins, it is evident that he coined a new aureus of 60 to pound of gold, and that he restored the denarius of silver. The netal of the silver coinage of Diocletian being purer than that f Caracalla, and the size of the aureus having been reduced about ne-fifth, the pieces which weigh 48 grains appear to represent the enarius of account, and to have been issued at the rate of 25 to an ureus. From this we may conclude that the relative value of lver to gold had been fixed by Diocletian as 14·27 to 1. It has een conjectured that the numerals XCVI, which we find on some f the silver coins of Diocletian and his colleagues, indicate that inety-six of these pieces were coined from a pound of silver. But this were the case, the normal weight of these coins ought to xceed 52 grains, and if 25 had been current for an aureus, they must ave been minted on a proportion of 16·6 to 1. The fact, however, , that the usual silver coins of Diocletian weigh 48 grains, and ie half generally from 22½ to 23 grains. These pieces appear to e the cententionales so frequently mentioned in the Codes, though e full weight of the 1-100th of a Roman pound ought to be 50·8. he loss of 2·8 grains for mintage and wear cannot, however, be nsidered as too great. Another silver coin, however, appears at is time, existing specimens of which weigh 62 grains; of these, erefore, about 80 must have been minted from a pound of silver. may be assumed, that in coins of pure silver where there is a fference in weight of more than five grains, accompanied with a fference of type and a perceptible difference in diameter, the ins were originally of different denominations and value. We d the mint, in the time of Zeno and Anastasius, issuing copper ins weighing little more than 5 grains, and in the time of Justinian ver coins of 5, 10, and 15 grains were in circulation at Constanople; so that it cannot be supposed that Diocletian and his lleagues could have issued coins weighing 48 grains, and others 62 grains, as pieces of the same value and denomination.[1]

Diocletian also introduced some new copper coins; one of these ighs one third of an ounce, and appears to have been called untianus and also follis.[2] Another weighs about a quarter of an

[1] Mommsen, in his valuable essay *Ueber den Verfall des Roemischen Münzwesens in Kaiserzeit* (p. 264), draws an average from coins which differ more than a quarter heir weights. Pinder and Friedländer (*Beiträge zur alteren Münzekünde*, 22) class ther coins which differ more than a quarter. Thus, well-preserved coins weighing and 62 grains, are classed together because they are all marked XCVI.

[2] Marcellini, *Chron.*, cited by Mommsen in Pinder and Friedländer, *Beiträge*, 123. re are copper coins of Diocletian and of Maximianus which have been plated, and gh more than one-third of an ounce. That representing one-third generally weighs grains. A smaller size weighs 110. The quarter ounce, from 106 to 108. The e weighing 110 marked with a star, may be the denarius or unit of the tariff. The e copper piece introduced by Diocletian which is generally plated, was probably the s, and passed in currency for an ounce of copper, so that 300, or 25 lb. of copper, ld be current for an aureus, which is one-sixth less than the proportion of copper to l indicated in the *Cod. Theod.* xi. 21, 2, as the aureus was one-sixth heavier than

ounce. The monetary system of Diocletian was soon changed and its historical interest would not be very great, but from the circumstance that we must seek in it for the key to explain the prices contained in the great tariff of the Roman empire which was published in the year 301, fixing a maximum price for almost every article which could be brought to market or produced by human industry. Considerable fragments of this curious and valuable decree, both in Greek and Latin, have been discovered in different provinces of the empire, proving that it received universal authority and it has occupied the attention of many learned men.[1] The attempt to regulate prices on one uniform scale over the whole extent of an empire so extensive as that of Rome, and whose provinces were in very different conditions of civilisation, must have produced much misery and confusion in trade. The monetary reforms of Diocletian appear to have been abolished from the necessity of abrogating the whole system on which the prices in this great tariff were based. It is possible, also, that there was an error in the proportion of value adopted between silver and gold, or that a change in their relative values took place about this time. Constantine the Great soon modified the coinage of Diocletian, but the changes he made indicate that the modification rather than a revolution in the monetary system was intended.

Constantine reduced the size of the aureus by coining 72 pieces from a pound of gold; and from this time, these coins received a new name, and were coined at Constantinople on the same standard until the Eastern Empire was destroyed by the Crusaders and Venetians in 1204. The gold coin of Constantine was called *solidus* in Latin, and *nomisma* in Greek. When, at a later period, similar pieces circulated in western Europe, they were called bezants or byzants. Gold and silver bullion of the standard purity was, after the time of Constantine, generally received in payment of large sums at the imperial treasury as well as in commercial transactions. In these payments, a pound of gold was reckoned as equal to 72 solidi, but we are not acquainted with the manner employed for verifying the purity of the metal in bars. It appears probable, however, that a much larger number of gold coins forming multiples of the solidus, were in general circulation than is usually supposed

the solidus. These folles are so abundant, that they must have formed an important part of the currency during the reign of Constantine I. Several passages in the later writers, relating to money, speak of the quadrans both as the quarter of the follis and as the quarter of an ounce, alluding probably to its value in currency. But those who desire to know the degree of confusion which exists in the names and in the evaluation of Roman coins, as transmitted to us by ancient compilers and lexicographers, will find much curious matter collected, and great learning poured forth without any very important result, in the work of Gronovius, *De Sestertiis*, or *De Pecunia vetere*.

[1] Count Borghesi considers the denarius of the tariff to be the tetrassarion, of which twenty-four were current to a denarius of silver, which would make a coin about the size of the copper denarius of Aurelian; and similar pieces of Diocletian are marked with a star.—Dureau de la Malle, *Economie politique des Romains*, i. 113.

Mommsen has published the most complete edition of the edict, with observations: *Das Edict Diocletians de Pretiis Rerum venalium*.

rom the small number now existing.[1] The legal proportion of lver to gold in bullion payments is not known with certainty until ne year 397, when it was fixed by law at $14\frac{2}{3}$ to 1.[2]

The change which Constantine made in the silver coinage, ppears to have added two new denominations to the pieces ready in circulation ; the miliarensis, called by the Greeks miliarion, and the siliqua, called by the Greeks keration. These new ins must have circulated for some time contemporaneously with lver money issued by Diocletian and his colleagues ; but the w system became that of the Eastern Empire for ages. Nevertheless, the first mention of the miliarision in an official act is und in a law of Justinian dated 536. But, from the derivation ven of the word by a writer of the period, we may conclude that e word had been long in use as the name of a very common lver coin.[3] The siliqua is mentioned in a law of the year 428, hen 24 were reckoned to the solidus ; and as the proportion of ver to gold had been already fixed by the law of 397 at $14\frac{2}{3}$ to 1, e weight of the siliqua ought to have been 42 grains.[4] A con-

[1] The proof that Constantine's solidi weighed 4 scruples of 288 to a Roman pound, in the law dated A.D. 325.—*Cod. Theod.* xii. 7, 1. Compare *Cod. Just.* x. 71; *Cod. Theod.* xii. 6, 13, and *Cod. Just.* x. 70, 5.

Elagabalus coined gold pieces of 100 aurei in addition to the double, quadruple and uple aurei of preceding emperors.—*Hist. Scrip. Aug.* Lampridius, "Alex. Sev." 38. nder and Friedländer (*Die Münzen Justinians*, 68) mention pieces of 9 solidi, or one-hth of a pound. The gold medallion of Justinian weighed 36 solidi, or half a pound. gory of Tours (*Historia Francorum*, vi. 2) mentions having seen gold coins of a pound ght sent by the emperor Tiberius II. to Chilperic. There are several very large gold llions of Valens in the Museum of Vienna, but they are generally fixed in a gold frame. ngez (*Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscrip.*, 2 Serie, ix. 277) estimates the weight of r at 19, 27, 33 and 62 aurei. Unfortunately, he seeks his unit of comparison in the eus of Nero, instead of the solidus of Constantine. The weight of the largest, as given Eckhell (viii. 153), is $11\frac{5}{8}$ Hungarian ducats ; by Arneth (*Synopsis num Rom.* 204) y 118. Now, as the Hungarian ducat weighs 53 grains, this piece is equal to 92 di. Another is stated by Eckhell (viii. 154) to weigh $51\frac{1}{2}$ ducats. This is exactly 40 di. Steinbüchel (*Recueil de Medaillons d'Or du Cabinet de Vienne*) has published ravings of these medallions of Valens. It deserves to be noticed, that the golden s affixed to the letters addressed by the emperors of Constantinople at a later period reign princes, were equal to single, double, triple, or quadruple solidi, according he etiquette of the Byzantine court. Constantine Porphyrogenitus mentions icularly, that a letter of his own to the Caliph of Egypt had a seal affixed to it of olidi, or a quarter of a pound.—*De Cæremon. Aulæ Byz.* ii. 48 ; p. 689, edit. Bonn.

silver medallion of Priscus Attalus in the British Museum weighs 1203 grains, rding to Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, re a reduced representation of this medal is given. The diameter of the original bout two inches. The weight of this piece is abnormal. To be a quarter of a an pound, it ought to have weighed 1260 grains ; and a silver medal representing lidus ought to weigh 1008 grains. It is true, 4 solidi are reckoned as equivalent to ound of silver by a law of Honorius and Theodosius II., dated 422 (*Cod. Theod.* 4, 27) ; but this law was intended to facilitate paying gold at that rate. Its object to enable four solidi to discharge claims for a pound of silver when a pound of r was worth five solidi. As the medal of Attalus must have been coined in 409 or there is no reason for supposing that the proportion of silver to gold was other $14\frac{2}{3}$ to 1, according to the standard of the Roman mint. Though considerably er the just weight, this medallion was probably issued as a quarter of a pound of r, 60 being reckoned as equal to a pound of gold.

Cod. Theod. xiii. 2.

Corpus Juris Civilis, Nov. cv. 23. Lydus, *De Mensibus*, iv. 9.

Coins of this weight are not uncommon.—*Cod. Theod.* xii. 4, 1, and xiii. 2. *Nov. or*, vii. 6.

siderable change in the relative value of gold and silver had consequently taken place since the times of Nero and Caracalla, but the rate as fixed in 397 remained the legal standard of the mint at Constantinople for several centuries.[1]

The weights of the existing coins of Constantine and his successors render it difficult to determine their denomination, and the proportion they bear to the solidus. If we reckon 12 miliarisia to a solidus, and take the proportion of silver to gold as 14·4 to 1, the miliarision ought to weigh 84 grains, and pieces of this size are found equal to one-sixtieth of a Roman pound.[2] Much confusion is found in the statements of the different writers who mention ancient coins. The texts are often corrupt, from having been adapted by copyists to more modern times, and vague denominations are used, or ancient terms are employed, which are quite inapplicable.[3]

A considerable change is observable in the copper coinage of Constantine, caused probably by the necessity of abrogating the tariff of Diocletian, and by the necessity of making it conform to the new system in the gold and silver money.

In the reign of Valentinian I., copper coins of a smaller size than those previously in use began to be coined in great quantity; and under Theodosius II. and his successors, until the reign of Anastasius, hardly any copper money, except these small coins, seems to have issued from the imperial mint. The consequence was, that the small currency of the empire again fell into a state of confusion. Of these small copper coins, 7200 pieces were current for a solidus according to a law of Valentinian III., dated in the year 445.[4] At nearly the same period also, another small copper coin, called a denarius, is said by Cassiodorus to have been exchanged at the rate of 6000 to a solidus.[5] The rarity of silver money during this period is shown by this evaluation of the gold currency in copper money. It is not easy to determine accurately to which of the existing copper coins the names of nummus and of denarius ought to be given, for we find that in 398 a loaf was sold for a nummus, and in 419 a pound of bacon was valued at 5 denarii.[6] In 396, the value of copper was fixed by law at 25 lb. for a solidus, and there seems reason for inferring that, at this

[1] *Cod. Theod.* xiii. 2, repeated *Cod. Just.* x. 76.

[2] *Cod. Theod.* xv. 9, 1.

[3] An accurate account of the weights of the known coins of Constantine and his successors, distinguishing the different types, is required to fix the denominations of those which can be ascertained. In the time of Constantine, the miliarensis may have been only 1⅓ siliqua. In that case, the coins weighing from 70 to 75 grains may be miliarenses. Those from 46 to 50 seem to be cententionales.—*Cod. Theod.* ix. 55, 1. Those from 37 to 42, siliquæ. It is possible that there was a variation in the proportion of silver to gold more than once in the interval between Diocletian and 396. The following are the weights of coins of different sizes, all having on the reverse, Vot. xx or xxx.; Mult. xxx. or xxxx. 84, 75, 49, 31. 21. Here, we have evidently five different denominations of silver coin in the reign of Constantius II. In my possession I have one, not well preserved, weighing 41 grains. The other weights are taken from Pinkerton, Pinder and Friedländer, and Mommsen.

[4] *Nov. Valentin.* iii. "De Pretio Sol." xiv. 1.

[5] *Cassiodori Var.* i. 10.

[6] *Cod. Theod.* xiv. 19, 1. *Cod. Theod.* xiv. 4, 10.

period, the copper coins of the empire were minted at the full value of the metal.[1] If the denarius and nummus had been coined on this standard, the denarius ought to weigh 21 grains, and the nummus 17½, and existing coins of Arcadius are found corresponding with these weights.[2] After Theodosius II., the copper coinage seems to have been again deteriorated.

In the year 395, Arcadius and Honorius prohibited the circulation of all silver coins larger than the cententionalis, which must have weighed rather more than 50 grains. They were particularly anxious to compel all private individuals to bring the large coins called decargyra to the mint. This law must for a time have put an end to the circulation of the pieces of sixty to a pound and miliarisia, whether identical or not.[3] After this time, the silver coinage of the Roman empire is rare, and in the interval between Theodosius II. and Anastasius even the copper coinage appears to have been depreciated.

Anastasius introduced a new copper coinage in the year 498, in order to relieve the people from the inconvenience resulting from the great variety in the weight and value of the coins in circulation, many of which must have been much defaced by the tear and wear of time. The new coinage was composed of pieces with their value marked on the reverse by large numeral letters indicating the number of units they contained. The nummus, which was the smallest copper coin then in circulation, appears to have been taken as this unit, and its weight had already fallen to about 6 grains. The pieces in general circulation were those of 1, 5, 10, 20, and 40 nummi, marked Α, Ε, Ι, Κ and Μ.[4]

Justin I. followed the type and standard of Anastasius, but the barbarous fabric of his coins, even when minted at Constantinople, is remarkable. The same system and the same barbarism appear in the copper money of Justinian I., until the twelfth year of his reign, A.D. 538. He then improved the fabric to prevent forgery, and added the date, numbering the years of his reign on the reverse. Though the value of copper had been fixed by the code at a higher rate than by the law of 396, since a solidus was exacted where twenty pounds of copper were due to the fisc, Justinian

[1] *Cod. Theod.* xi. 21, 2. When this law is repeated by Justinian, the fisc exacted a solidus for every 20 lb. of copper due.—*Cod. Just.* x. 29.

[2] The smallest coins of Arcadius agree. A perfect Vot. v. weighs 17½, a tolerably preserved Salus republicæ, 19; and the size of this latter, which appears to be the denarius, is visibly larger.

[3] *Cod. Theod.* ix. 23, 2.

[4] *Marcellini Chron.*, as cited by Mommsen, Pinder and Friedländer, *Beiträge*, i. 123. This passage states that Anastasius coined pieces called teruntiani by the Romans, and follerales by the Greeks; but none of the coins of Anastasius weigh a third of an ounce, so the passage is supposed to indicate that the large pieces marked Μ are those indicated. They weigh on an average 260 grains. I presented to the British Museum a set of small coins of this period, marked Α.Β.Γ.Δ.& Ε, weighing 6, 11, 19, 24 and 29 grains respectively. They were found at Athens, and the Β.Γ.& Δ were not previously known. I have now in my possession pieces marked Α, weighing from 6 to 10 grains. This gives a variation, in the piece Μ, from 240 to 400 grains. The Roman ounce at this time was equal to 420 grains, but no Μ of more than 384 grains has, I believe, been found, even of Justinian.

nevertheless increased the size of his copper coins.[1] Now, if we suppose the coins to have corresponded with the value of copper as indicated in the code, the normal weight of the nummus being 10½ grains, the piece of 40 nummi would be equal to a Roman ounce, and 240 ought to have been current for a solidus. No piece of 40 nummi has yet been found weighing an ounce, and it has generally been supposed that these pieces are the coins mentioned by Procopius, who says that previous to the reform the money-changers gave 210 obols, which were called pholles, for a solidus, but that Justinian fixed the value of the solidus at 180 obols, by which he robbed the people of one-sixth of the value of every solidus in circulation.[2] It has, however, lately been conjectured that the obolus to which Procopius alludes was a silver coin, and according to the proportion between silver and gold then observed at the Roman mint, a silver coin current as $\frac{1}{180}$ of a solidus ought to have weighed 5·6 grains, and such pieces exist.[3] It is not probable that the copper coinage of Justinian was ever minted at its real metallic value, and it is certain that he made frequent reductions in its weight, and that specimens can be found differing in weight which were issued from the same mint in the same year. An issue of unusually deteriorated money in the twenty-sixth year of his reign caused an insurrection, which was appeased by recalling the debased pieces.[4]

The system of marking the copper coins of the Eastern Empire with the letters indicating their value continued until another great monetary reform by Basil I., after a lapse of more than three centuries. But during this long period frequent changes took place in the size of the pieces, which must consequently have been often current at a depreciated value.[5]

[1] Compare *Cod. Just.* x. 29, 1, with *Cod. Theod.* xi. 21, 2.

[2] Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* sect. 25.

[3] Isambert, in his notes to a new edition of the *Secret History* of Procopius, has published a learned dissertation on the money of Justinian. He gives an engraving of a coin from his own collection, which he considers the silver obolos. It weighs rather more than 5 grains.—*Anecdota par Procope*, trad. par M. Isambert, p. 860.

The phollis and obolos, at a later period, were certainly two distinct copper coins.

[4] Malalas, p. 80, edit. Ven. No traces of this deterioration have been observed in the coins of this year, but it is possible that the reduction was confined to the smaller copper pieces, κέρμα, which are generally rare. The large coins marked **M**, which have generally been considered to be the phollis or obolos alluded to by Procopius, are extremely abundant. If so, and 180 were current for a solidus, their normal weight, according to the value of copper in the *Cod.* x. 29, ought to have been 360 grains; as, however, the heaviest seldom weigh more than 366 grains, the solidus, if we suppose these to be obolos, was then exchanged for 15 pounds 8 ounces of copper.

[5] It is curious to note the variations which took place in the weight of the large pieces marked **M**, and the attempts repeatedly made to restore its value by an augmentation in its size.

A.D.			Grains.
491–539.	Six pieces of Anastasius, Justin I., and Justinian I., before his reform of the coinage, average		264
540.	Justinian I., Constantinople		*384
,,	,,	,,	340
,,	,,	Nicomedia	366
541.	,,	Constantinople	361
,,	,,	,,	332
,,	,,	Carthage	336

The silver coins of Justinian were numerous, and of various sizes nd denominations, which have not yet been identified with the xisting pieces. By a law of the year 536, Justinian allowed the onsuls to scatter silver coins among the people, which had been orbidden by Marcian. Four denominations are enumerated, with he addition that similar pieces might also be distributed. Those nentioned are miliarisia, mela, kaukia, and tetragona.[1] There is o direct testimony concerning the value of the miliarision at this ime, but we know that it was subsequently current as one-twelfth f a solidus. At this rate, its normal weight ought, as we have lready seen, to be 84 grains; but as a legal glossator says that it as at one time only equal to a keration and three quarters, it may, n the reign of Justinian I., have weighed 73½ grains. The kera- ion was the twenty-fourth of the solidus, so that it weighed 42 rains. No data exist for determining the value of the pieces alled mela, kaukia, and tetragona.[2]

It is no easy task to affix names to the specimens of Justinian's oins which exist; but six different sizes can be distinguished, the argest weighing about 65 grains, and the smallest about 5. We nust bear in mind that it sometimes happens that a very common oin in ancient times is now extremely rare; so that though we annot identify the keration with any of the existing coins of Jus- nian, there is not, from that circumstance, sufficient reason to onclude that it was not coined in abundance of its normal weight. nd the same may be said of the miliarision, though it may always ave been less abundant. The scarcity of the keration may arise om its having been employed in paying the troops in the pro- inces, and from its always bearing an agio, on account of its cir-

A.D.		Grains.
554.	Justinian I., Antioch	286
555.	,, Constantinople	273
557.	,, ,,	263
,,	,, Cyzicus	263
567.	Justin II., Cyzicus	236
579.	Tiberius II., Constantinople	274
582.	Maurice, Constan.	186
586.	,, ,,	170
601.	,, ,,	185
610.	Heraclius, Constantinople	160
624.	,, ,,	60
628.	,, ,,	102
668–681.	Constantine IV. (Pogonatus)	288
780–790.	Constantine VI. and Irene	48
813–820	? Leo V. and Constantine	85
	The attribution of these coins may be doubtful. They may be of Leo III. and Constantine V.	
821–829.	Michael II. and Theophilus	138
829–840.	Theophilus	90

All these, except the heaviest of Constantinople, marked with an asterisk, are well reserved, and in my possession.

A well-preserved **K** of Justinian's twelfth year, A.D. 539, weighs 173 grains; one of s thirty-eighth, of Thessalonica, only 80. I gave one of his thirty-ninth, as that date ad not been previously found, to the British Museum, which, from my memorandum, eighed 76 grains.

[1] *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Nov. cv. 2.

[2] The authorities can be found under the respective words, in Ducange, *Glossarium t Script. Med. et Inf. Græcitatis*, and *De Imperatorum Constantinopolitanorum*, *u d'Inferioris Ævi vel Imperii uti vocant numismatibus Dissertatio.*

culation in the most distant parts of the empire, and even in the East beyond its limits.[1] The diminutive size of the smallest coins of Justinian need not cause any surprise. The Dutch pieces of five cents weigh only 10 grains, and the French of twenty centimes only 15 grains, though silver is now less valuable than in the time of Justinian. There seems no reason for supposing that silver was coined with less attention to its weight at the mint of Constantinople, in the sixth century, than it had been by the Athenians a thousand years earlier. The slaves who were sent to market at Athens had no difficulty in distinguishing three different silver coins, all fractions of the obolos, which weighed only 11 grains. These diminutive pieces weigh respectively 8, $5\frac{1}{2}$, and $2\frac{3}{4}$ grains, and they are still detected by the sharp eyes of the labourers who excavate at Athens, and collected from time to time.[2]

No official change appears to have taken place in the silver coinage under the successors of Justinian, until Heraclius, in the year 615, coined pieces weighing 6 grams, equal to 105 grains, consequently 48 were coined from a pound of silver. The normal proportion of these pieces to the solidus was $9\frac{6}{10}$; but as the currency of the empire was at this time in a state of confusion, in consequence of the financial embarrassment caused by the conquests of the Persians, who occupied Syria, Egypt, and a great part of Asia Minor, this new hexagram was probably paid at a higher rate by the imperial treasury.[3] Indeed, it is possible that this coin was

[1] Colonel Leake ("Numismata Hellenica," *European Greece*, p. 25) observes, that although the tetrobolon must anciently have been very common, having been the ordinary pay of an Athenian foot-soldier, it is now very rare, and generally much worn. One in my possession, well preserved, weighs forty-two grains.

[2] The six different classes of coins seem to be:—

		Grains.
I.	That engraved by Pinder and Friedländer (*Die Münzen Justinians*, p. 71)	64.5
II.	A coin mentioned by Isambert, p. 859	46.9
III.	With the reverse, Vot. Mut. **H T I**, 19 to 21	21.
IV.	Coins mentioned by Pinkerton, Pinder and Friedländer, and Isambert	14. to 16.
V.	Do. do. do.	8. to 12.
VI.	Small coin engraved by Isambert, pl. iii. 7	4.65 to 5.735
	Coins of Zeno, Anastasius, and Justin I., are found, weighing	11.

It may not be superfluous to observe, that the ancient Athenians had no less than nine silver coins in common use, smaller than the drachma, the value of which was 9½d. The following list indicates the normal weight of these pieces as they issued from the Athenian mint, taken from Colonel Leake's "Numismata Hellenica," where the various types by which they were distinguished are described. The weight of pieces in my own collection is also given, to show the average deterioration in ancient coins where the type is preserved.

	Standard.		G. F.'s Collection.
Pentobolon	56.25	type much worn	50. grains.
Tetrobolon	45.	well preserved	42.
Triobolon, or half-drachma	33.75	two, well preserved, each	32.
Diobolon	22.5	two, worn, each	18.75
Trihemiobolon, 1½ obol.,	16.87	tolerable preservation	15.
Obolos	11.25	average of six	10.
Tritemorion, ¾	8.45	average of two	6.5
Hemiobolion, ½	5.62	average of six fine	5.4
Tetartemorion ¼	2.8	average of three	2.15

[3] *Chron. Pasch.* 386, edit. Par. Theophanes, 254, edit. Par. The hexagram and miliarision of Heraclius and his successors seem to have been of the same type. Two pieces of Heraclius, with the reverse "Deus adjuta Romanis," were purchased by me at

ssued at the rate of six for a solidus, since it was coined for the urpose of facilitating or partially concealing the payment of alaries, pensions, and donatives at a reduced rate equal to one-half f their previous amount. In the year 621 we are informed that leraclius coined miliarisia in great quantity for the expenses of is Persian campaigns. Coins of the same type as the hexagram f Heraclius were struck by Heraclius, Constantine, Constans II., nd Constantine IV. (Pogonatus).[1] The copper coinage of Herac- us is generally of the most barbarous fabric, and the size of the eces bearing the same denomination varies in the most extra- dinary manner. Constantine IV. restored the copper coinage to s condition in the latter years of Justinian I., but under Justinian . it became again depreciated.

The money of the Isaurian dynasty is rare. The hexagram dis- ppears ; but the uncertainty in the attribution of the coins of this eriod renders it unsafe to make any conjectures concerning the isting pieces. At this time the silver coins having the name and le of the emperor across the field on one side, and a cross on eps with "Jesus Christus nica" on the other, appear to have been troduced, and it seems very possible that the coins usually cribed to Leo V. the Armenian, and his son Constantine, really long to Leo III. and his son Constantine V. Coins of this type e found of three different weights, 30, 41, and 46 grains. Those eighing 30 and 41 grains are so similar in size that they could ly be distinguished by the names of the emperors or by weighing em. The copper coinage of this period is greatly diminished in e, but the Amorian dynasty made an attempt to improve it. here can be no doubt that it circulated at a high conventional lue, which it received from the mint.[2]

Basil I. became sole emperor in 867. He does not seem to have ade any change in the silver coinage, for the principal silver coin ring the long period that his dynasty governed the empire is the ce which weighs 41 grains, and is in all probability the keration $\frac{1}{24}$ of a solidus.[3] In the copper coinage Basil I. seems to have en the author of a great reform, for it can hardly be doubted that

bizond. They differ only in their thickness and weight. One weighs 101 grains, the er 72 grains. Sabatier observed a similar variation in examples he purchased at lis. One in the possession of Mr. Lambros, dealer in medals at Corfou, weighed 72 grains.

[1] Tannini, *Supplementum ad Bandurii Numism. Imp. Rom.*, gives the weight of eral pieces. One of Constans II. and Constantine IV., in my possession, weighs 72 ins. Another of Constantine IV., of the same size, but thicker, perhaps a piece of grams, weighs 88 grains. It is impossible to conjecture how much of the variation ch takes place in the imperial coinage arises from the issue of a deteriorated coinage the emperors for some temporary purpose. In the Eastern Empire we see that an anic law existed, though it was often violated.

[2] Well-engraved representations of the coins of the Eastern Empire, from Anastasius, be found in the works of Saulcy, *Essai de Classification des Suites monetaires zantines;* and Marchant, *Lettres sur la Numismatique et l'Histoire*, nouvelle ion.

[3] In the preface of the second edition of my *Byzantine History*, there are represen- ons of the silver coins of John I. (Zimisces), and Basil II., and Constantine VIII., the weight is erroneously given as 44 grains, instead of 41.

he restored the large brass coin previously marked **M** to its original weight in the reign of Anastasius. It was now called phollis, and is the largest of the Byzantine coins having a sacred type. The obverse has the bust of our Saviour, and on the reverse the words "Jesus Christus Basileu–Basile–" across the field. The weight of these pieces, when of good fabric, is 260 to 276 grains.[1] The other copper coin in general circulation was the obolos, bearing the effigy of the emperor on the obverse, and his name and title across the field on the reverse. Well-preserved specimens weigh from 111 to 125 grains, but those of Romanus I, or of Constantine VII (Porphyrogenitus) struck over Romanus, frequently weigh more than 140 grains.[2]

It has been generally supposed that John Zimisces introduced the sacred type in the Byzantine mint, because two historians say that he placed the image of our Saviour on the nomisma (solidus) and on the obolos, which was previously the case, and inscribed on the reverse in Roman letters, "Jesus Christus Basileus Basileon." The plain meaning of this passage seems to be, that John I. made a change in the type of the gold nomisma and of the copper obolos which had previously been distinguished by the portrait of the emperor; but, strange to say, numismatists, who generally pay such exclusive attention to types and sizes of coins, have given a different interpretation to these words. Existing coins confirm the plain meaning of the passage. It is true that no gold nomisma of the sacred type has been found; but this is not astonishing, as those of another type exist, coined probably during the first years of his reign; and as succeeding emperors restored their portraits to the obverse of the nomisma, all those of a sacred type may have been reminted or melted down. But the smaller copper pieces, which appear to have been the obolos, and which had been previously impressed with the emperor's portrait, disappear from the Byzantine coinage in the reign of John Zimisces; and coins of a sacred type of this size are common, though not so extremely abundant as those of the larger size, which I suppose to be the phollis. The portrait of the emperor does not reappear on Byzantine copper until the reign of Constantine X. (Ducas), A.D. 1059, when it is found on the phollis. The smaller copper coins, which were parts of the obolos, are rare during the Basilian dynasty, and cannot be accurately identified.

[1] A representation of this coin is given in the preface to the second edition of my *Byzantine History*, No. 4.

[2] There can be no doubt that Saulcy is wrong in attributing the coins of Romanus to the second, instead of the first of the name. I gave an example of Constantine VII. struck over Romanus, to the British Museum, and I have two specimens in my possession, besides three of Constantine VII. and Romanus II. struck over Romanus I.

[3] Cedrenus, ii. 683. Glycas, 308, edit. Par. "Προσέταξε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ῥωμαϊστὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀβολῷ εἰκόνα ἐγγράφεσθαι τοῦ Σωτῆρος, μὴ πρότερον τοῦτο γινομένου· ἐγράφοντο δὲ καὶ γράμματα ῥωμαϊστὶ ἐν θατέρῳ μέρει ἄδε τὰ διεξιόντα· Ἰησους Χριστὸς Βασιλεὺς Βασιλέων· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ οἱ κατόπιν ἐτήρησαν βασιλεῖς." There is in my possession a well-preserved piece, with the portrait of Romanus I. struck over the earlier phollis, with this type.

The next remarkable change in the coinage of the Roman or yzantine empire was the introduction of concave pieces, *scyphati ummi*. This form was introduced as early as 1024, but it did not ecome the prevailing type of the gold, silver, and copper coinage, ntil the end of the eleventh century.[1] No change in the weight value of the gold and silver pieces was made, in consequence of ie introduction of concave money; but the size and weight of the opper coins was greatly reduced as forgery was rendered more fficult. The phollis and obolos appear to have been generally oncave, and their fractions of the usual form. Under the Comneni ese smaller pieces are numerous.[2]

The coinage of the Byzantine empire appears to have been depre- ated after the reign of Manuel I. (Comnenus); and the coinage the Greek empire of Constantinople, after its reconquest from e Flemish emperors, fell into a state of disorder. The gold ucats of Italy were then more esteemed than the ducati, michelati, d manuelati, of the Eastern Empire; and the *gros tournois* of e French kings, and the aspers of the emperors of Trebizond, ere more valued in eastern commerce than the silver money of the aleologi of Constantinople.

From the time of Justinian, or even earlier, accounts were kept solidi, keratia, and folles, or in solidi, miliarisia, and folles; and is system continued until the Roman empire was destroyed by e Crusaders and Venetians.[3] Large sums were reckoned in ntenaries, or hundred pounds-weight of gold or silver bullion. ie gold coins in circulation were the *solidus*, called by the Greeks misma, and by the Western nations byzant; the *semisseion*, or lf solidus; the trimission, or one-third; and the tetarteron, or arter.[4] The silver coins were numerous, but latterly the *milia- sion*, keration, and half-keration, appear to have been the most undant.[5] The copper coins were the *phollis*, the obolos, and parently, at least, two smaller denominations.

The rarity of Byzantine silver coins does not appear to arise m their having been coined in small quantity, but from the con- nt demand for silver in the East, where the Indian trade and e silversmiths have always consumed a great quantity. The good ver money of the earlier sultans of Constantinople is almost as re as that of the last emperors.

The gradual transformation of the Eastern Empire from a man to a Greek state may be traced in the coinage as coincident h a similar change in the institutions and the general adminis-

[1] Tannini, *Supp. ad Banduri Num. Imp. Rom.*, 428.

[2] There are flat pieces of four different sizes in the time of the Comneni. The est may be the obolos. Those of the reigns of John II. and Manuel I., of erent types, weigh 72, 43, 32, and 24 grains.

[3] *Analecta Græca*, Paris, 1668, p. 316—"Antiquum rationarum Augusti Cæsaris et um rationarum Alexii Comneni Imperatoris."

[4] The tetarteron is much rarer than the other fractions of the solidus. One of ophilus, in perfect preservation, weighs 17 grains.

[5] The commonest silver coins of Manuel I. weigh 45 to 46 grains; and I possess a of Nicephorus III. struck over Michael VII., which weighs only 13, but it is im- ect. The normal weights of the silver coins have been already mentioned.

tration. Under Constantine and his successors until Leo I., every thing in the manners and habits of Constantinople was Roman; but under Anastasius, Greek letters appear as indications of value on the copper coins; and under Justinian I. it appears that the imperial heralds addressed the people in the Greek language when assembled at the chariot-races in the circus. Yet it is curious to observe how slowly the movement advanced which led the government of the Eastern Empire to abandon the systematic administrative tyranny of Rome for the arbitrary despotism of Greece. Heraclius, in the early part of the seventh century, first introduced a Greek legend, *ἐν τοῦτο νίκα*, on the copper coins of rude fabric which were probably coined for the use of the troops and the provincials during his Persian campaigns. The Greek titles of Basileus and Despotes make their first appearance in the place of Augustus during the eighth century. In the middle of the ninth we find Greek inscriptions on the reverses of several coins. A copper coin of Theophilus has the title Augustus, another *Θeofil' basileus* round the portrait, and on the reverse *Θeofile Augouste s nikas.* There is a coin of Michael III. with two portraits. That of the obverse has the legend *Mihael imperat.*, that of the reverse *Basilius rex.* Under the Basilian dynasty, Greek inscriptions occupy the field of the reverse both of the silver and copper coins, but the reverse of the gold is usually a bust of our Saviour, with the legend *Jesus Christus Rex Regnantium.* This Latin inscription continues on the solidus until the latter part of the eleventh century: it is found, I believe, for the last time, in the reign of Michael VII. (A.D. 1078).

Alexius I. (Comnenus) may be considered the first Emperor of the East who was entirely Greek. After his accession, Latin never again appears on the coins of the Roman empire, so that its transformation into the Byzantine monarchy was then complete.

TABLES OF ROMAN MONEY.

Augustus and his Successors.—B.C. 31 to A.D. 54.

As

2 = Dupondius.
4 = 2 = Sestertius Æ.
8 = 4 = 2 = Quinarius Æ.
16 = 8 = 4 = 2 = Denarius of 84 to lb. Æ.
400 = 200 = 100 = 50 = 25 = Aureus of 40 to lb. Æ.

Parts of As.

Quadrans.
$1\frac{1}{3}$ = Triens.
2 = $1\frac{1}{2}$ = Semissis.
4 = 3 = 2 = As.

Nero and his Successors.—A.D. 54 to 215.

Quinarius, Æ and Æ.
Denarius of 96 to lb.
25 = Aureus of 45 to lb.

CARACALLA AND HIS SUCCESSORS.—A.D. 215 TO 268.

Quinarius, Æ and Æ.

2 = Denarius of 96 to lb.
3 = 1½ = Argenteus of 60 to lb.
50 = 25 = 16⅔ = Aureus of 50 to lb.
100 Argentei = 6 Aurei.

AURELIAN AND HIS SUCCESSORS.—A.D. 275 TO 300

Assarion.

4 = Denarius of copper.
84 = 21 = Argenteus or Denarius of account.
2100 = 525 = 25 = Aureus of 50 to lb.

DIOCLETIAN AND HIS COLLEAGUES, AFTER A.D. 300.

ssarion.

4 = Denarius of copper.
16 = 4 = Follis.
192 = 48 = 12 = Denarius of 48 grs. Æ or cententionalis.
4800 = 1200 = 300 = 25 = Aureus of 60 to the pound.

CONSTANTINE AND HIS SUCCESSORS.—A.D. 325 TO 491.

Nummus or denarius.

20 = Follis.
240 = 12 = Siliqua Æ.
480 = 24 = 1¾ or 2 = Miliarensis.
5760 = 288 = 24 = 12 = Solidus of 72 to lb.

ANASTASIUS AND HIS SUCCESSORS.—A.D. 491 TO 867.

Noumion.

5 = Є Pentanoumion.
10 = 2 = I Dekanoumion.
20 = 4 = 2 = K Eikosarion or obolos.
40 = 8 = 4 = 2 = M Follis Æ and Æ.
240 = 48 = 24 = 12 = 6 = Keration Æ.
480 = 96 = 48 = 24 = 12 = 2 = Miliarision.
5760 to 7200 = 180 = 24 = 12 = Solidus or Nomisma. to 210

BASIL I. TO THE DESTRUCTION OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE. A.D. 867 TO 1204.

Small copper pieces of unknown denominations.

Obolos Æ.
2 = Phollis Æ.
12 = 6 = Keration Æ.
24 = 12 = 2 = Miliarision.
288 = 144 = 24 = 12 = Solidus, Nomisma, or Byzant Æ.

III

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SITE OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE

The majority of Christians feel anxious to ascertain that the precise spot where the body of Christ was interred is still known. The voice of reason may suggest that, in a religious point of view, this can at present be a matter of little importance; for "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." And it is indeed possible that, from the actual state of education in all Christian nations, superstition will be likely to gain more than true religion by pointing out the exact site of the death and burial of our Saviour. Still, it is a duty to search after the truth, and to examine whether sufficient evidence exists to determine the site of the Holy Sepulchre, under the conviction that when the truth is clearly established, it will aid religion in destroying superstition.

It would give every Christian a sentiment of dissatisfaction, as well as of melancholy, to adopt the opinion that no satisfactory evidence can be found to determine the real site of Christ's death and burial. Yet, if none exist, then the thousands of sincere believers who, for fifteen centuries, have annually repaired in pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to visit spots shown as the Golgotha and the place of the resurrection of Scripture, have been the deluded votaries of a pious fraud. How can the uninstructed hope to learn the way of truth, or expect to avoid becoming the dupes of those who speculate on man's superstition, if they have been imposed on in this instance? Of what value is history, if it has entirely omitted to preserve the means of confirming, or refuting, any hypothesis directly affecting the identification of sites so deeply interesting to a large majority of the most enlightened inhabitants of the globe since the commencement of the fourth century?

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE SITE OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

Various opinions have been formed, by learned and conscientious Christians, concerning the verity of the sites now shown as Golgotha and the place of the resurrection: and a good deal of discussion has taken place between those, on the one hand, who declare that the sites reverenced by pilgrims have not the smallest title to be considered authentic, and those, on the other, who maintain that they are the precise spots mentioned by the Evangelists—that the Calvary of the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem is that spot to which "He, bearing his cross, went forth into a place called the Place of a Skull, which is called in Hebrew Golgotha, where they crucified Him"[1]—and that the Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre

[1] St. John xix. 17.

built over that "new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet id."[1]

The first attempt to assail the identity of the sepulchre now nown was made by a German named Korte, who visited Jerusalem 1738.[2] But the ablest assailant of the actual site is Dr. Robin-on, the author of a learned work on the geography of Palestine, ntitled *Biblical Researches*.[3] This work enters into a long investi-ation of all the questions connected with the topography of Jeru-ulem. The opponents as well as the supporters of Dr. Robinson's ews consider it the chief source of information on the subject, for ey use it as their guide even while they attack its conclusions. he able clergymen who composed *The Narrative of a Mission of nquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland in* 1839, declare at Dr. Robinson's arguments may justly be regarded as a final ttlement of this long-agitated question.

The work of Dr. Robinson is the most learned and impartial atement of the reasoning of the dissentients.[4] In order not to jure the clear and candid manner in which he states his case, I anscribe his own words. "A true estimate of this long-agitated uestion must depend on two circumstances. As there can be no oubt that both Golgotha and the Sepulchre lay outside of the ancient ty, it must first be shown that the present site may also anciently ave been without the walls. Or, should this in itself appear to e impossible, then it must be shown that there were, in the fourth entury, historical or traditional grounds for fixing upon this site, rong enough to counterbalance such an apparent impossibility."[5] To the tourists who venture to give decided opinions of dissent these principles, without studying the writings of Dr. Robinson Dr. Tobler, it is enough to observe, with Bacon,—"Certainly ere be that delight in giddiness, and count it a bondage to fix a elief, affecting free-will in thinking as well as in acting."[6] *Plus gare potest asinus, quam probare philosophus.*

On the other hand, the identity of the present sites has found oquent defenders in Chateaubriand, Mr. Wilde, Dr. Olin, Lord ugent, the Reverend George Williams, and the Reverend Albert chaffter.[7]

1 St. John xix. 41.

2 Jonas Korte's *Reise nach dem gelobten Lande, Aegypten, Syrien, und Meso-tamien.* Halle, 1751. 8vo.

3 *Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai, and Arabia Petræa.* By dward Robinson, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1841.

4 The opinions of Dr. Robinson have been ably supported by Dr. Tobler.—*Golgatha,* . St. Gallen, 1851.

5 *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 66.

6 Bacon's *Essays*, "Of Truth."

7 F. A. de Chateaubriand. *Itineraire de Paris à Jerusalem.* 3 tomes. Paris, 11. 8vo.

W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A. *Narrative of a Voyage to Madeira and along the Shores the Mediterranean.* 2 vols. Dublin, 1840.

Stephen Olin, D.D. *Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land.* vols. New York, 1843.

Lord Nugent. *Lands Classical and Sacred.* 2 vols. London, 1845.

Rev. George Williams. *The Holy City; or, Historical and Topographical Notices Jerusalem.* 8vo. London, 1845.

A. Schaffter. *Die ächte lage des Heiligen Grabes.* Bern, 1849.

Mr. Fergusson has advanced a third opinion, based solely on architectural proofs, and maintains that the Mosque of Omar indicates the site of the Holy Sepulchre.[1]

HISTORY OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

Before attempting to investigate the existing evidence relative to the identification of the site of the Holy Sepulchre, it is necessary to collect the historical information that remains, connected with the subject. A review of the historical notices preserved will enable us to appreciate the precise bearing of the evidence to be adduced.

The place of the crucifixion was near the walls of Jerusalem, and without the gate. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate."[2] And St. John: "For the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city."[3] The spot was called, in Hebrew, Golgotha. In the Latin translation of St. Luke, it is translated Calvaria.[4]

The tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa was situated in a garden, so near the spot where Jesus was crucified, that it was said to be in the same place, or at Golgotha. "Now, in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was man never yet laid. There laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand."[5]

The crucifixion and interment of our Lord took place, according to the common chronology, in the year 33.

WALL OF JERUSALEM EXTENDED BY AGRIPPA.

About the year 42, King Agrippa commenced building a new wall, to enclose the suburbs on the north side of the city. This wall commenced at the tower Hippicus, and proceeded to the north, to the tower Psephinus; it then extended to the vicinity of the monument of Helena; advancing further, it passed by the sepulchral caverns of the Kings, and returned to the tower of the corner. It joined the old wall again at the valley of Kedron.[6] This new wall is supposed by all modern writers to have included the site of the crucifixion within its circuit.

Agrippa did not complete this wall on the plan he had originally adopted. The jealousy of the Emperor Claudius was awakened by

[1] *An Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem*: with restored Plans of the Temple, and Plans, Sections, and Details of the Church built by Constantine the Great over the Holy Sepulchre, now known as the Mosque of Omar. London, 1847. The architectural illustrations and arguments of this work are excellent; the inductions are often erroneous, and the proposed topography is at variance with history.

[2] Hebrews xiii. 12.

[3] St. John xix. 20.

[4] St. Matthew xxvii. 33: "And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, ... they crucified Him." St. Luke xxiii. 33: "And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary, there they crucified him." St. John xix. 17: "And he, bearing his cross, went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha."

[5] St. John xix. 41.

[6] Josephus, *Jewish War*, book v. chap. iv. 2.

e Governor of Judea; and Agrippa thought it prudent to modify s design in the execution, and give the new fortifications less rength than he had intended. But, from the description Josephus as left us of the work, it was a magnificent monument of military chitecture; equal—in the style of the masonry, the size of the ones, and the solidity of the building,—to the most celebrated rtions of the ancient walls, and even to the foundations of the mple itself.

The whole circuit of the city, after the construction of this wall, as 33 stades, or about $3\frac{1}{3}$ geographical miles. The present walls nclose a circumference of about $2\frac{1}{8}$ geographical miles.

TAKING OF JERUSALEM BY TITUS.

Until the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, in 70, no change could ave taken place in the aspect of Golgotha or of the tomb. The ace must have been known to every inhabitant of Jerusalem. ut the destruction of the city, after its conquest by Titus, might ave produced a great change. That destruction, however, was ot so complete as is usually reported. Josephus indeed mentions at the city and the Temple were demolished; but at the same me he relates, that Titus commanded the troops to leave the most markable of the towers, which defended Jerusalem, standing as memorial of the splendid construction of the fortifications of the ncient city. And he preserved the whole of the western wall, form a fortification for the garrison he placed in his conquest. he towers left standing were, Phasælus, Hippicus, and Mariamne; d as it was without the walls that Christ suffered, the place, if on is side of the city, probably underwent no change. The garrison nsisted of the tenth legion, some squadrons of cavalry, and veral cohorts of infantry.[1] A large force to be stationed in a ined city.

Around this garrison, permanently established on the western le of the ancient city, a town of some size would immediately be med, for Palestine continued to be extremely populous, and the ws still reverenced Jerusalem and were allowed to visit it. The ristians, too, though they fled to Pella before the siege, soon turned; and it continued to be the residence of a Christian bishop.[2] e are informed by Eusebius, that Simeon, the son of Cleophas, as elected to the vacant see at Jerusalem on the return of the wish Christians, so that a considerable number of the native in- bitants must have soon assembled in an open town under the otection of the Roman garrison.[3]

It is needless to offer any conjecture concerning the portion of e city wall preserved by Titus. In a military point of view, ount Zion would appear the most suitable place for a fortified mp within the walls, and that the towers preserved formed part

1 Josephus, *Jewish War*, book vii. chap. i.
2 *Flight to Pella.* Eusebius, *Eccles. History*, book iii. chap. iii.
3 Eusebius; *Eccles. History*, book iii. chap. xi.

of the fortifications of the city of David which were added to t old wall by Herod, is mentioned by Josephus.[1]

The neighbourhood of Golgotha was not a thickly inhabit quarter. It had a garden and a tomb in its immediate vicini The present site of the Holy Sepulchre, from its position, could n have been within the fortifications of Titus. It must also be rec lected that the Christian bishop elected to the see of Jerusale after the conquest by Titus, was Simeon the son of Cleophas, w was the cousin of Jesus, as appears from St. John: "Now the stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's siste Mary, the wife of Cleophas.[2] These circumstances render it impro able that the site of Christ's crucifixion and burial was forgott at this period.

FOUNDATION OF THE ROMAN COLONY OF ÆLIA CAPITOLIN IN JERUSALEM, BY HADRIAN.

The Emperor Hadrian, in order to destroy the nationality of t Jews, determined to transform Jerusalem into a Roman city.[3] Th measures he adopted caused a rebellion in Palestine, and the rebe took possession of Jerusalem. The success of this rebellion attes the numbers, wealth, and power of the Jews, and proves that th had continued to preserve some degree of political organisati even after their subjugation by Titus. The Romans slowly collecte their forces. The Jews seized on fifty fortified places and nine hu dred and eighty-five large villages. The Roman troops at la crushed the rebellion, recovered Jerusalem, exterminated the rebel and punished the rest of the nation as irreconcilable enemies Rome.

When peace was restored, Hadrian endeavoured to efface memory of the ancient Jerusalem: he issued a decree forbidding an Jew to return to the city; and guards were stationed to preve them even from approaching it. A new city, called Ælia Capit lina, was founded on its ruins, which was peopled as a Rom colony, and adorned with the usual public buildings, theatre baths, and pagan temples. The inhabitants of Ælia Capitoli were doubtless chiefly Roman freedmen and Syrian Greeks. Eve the Christians who were allowed to settle in this new city wer converted Gentiles, for the Christian Jews, in the eyes of th Roman administration, continued to retain the stamp of the nationality, and consequently dared not approach the place.[4]

The Jewish writers agree with St. Jerome in relating that th

[1] *Jewish War*, book v. chap. iv. v. vi.
[2] St. John xix. 25; compare Eusebius, *Eccles. History*, book iii. chap. xi.
[3] Dio Cassius, lxix. c. 12.
[4] Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 6. Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 47. Ὅτι δὲ φυλασσετ (Ἱερουσαλὴμ) ὑφ' ὑμῶν, ὅπως μηδεὶς ἐν αὐτῇ γένηται, καὶ θανατος τ καταλαβομένου Ἰουδαίου ἐσιόντες ὥρισθαι, ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστασθε. Sulpicii Seve *Hist. Sac.* ii. 45. "Militum cohortem custodias in perpetuum agitare jussit, qu Judæos omnes Hierosolymæ aditu arceret."

man governor, Titus Annius Rufus, ordered the foundations of Temple to be torn up, and the plough to be drawn over the , as a mark that it was devoted to perpetual desolation.[1]

SITE OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE DEFACED.

Everything was done by Hadrian to give Ælia Capitolina the cha- ter of a pagan city as well as of a Roman colony. Not only re the Jews expelled for ever from the capital of their forefathers, their prejudices and feelings were insulted in order to induce m to avoid the spot. A temple was dedicated to Jupiter on the of the temple of Solomon. Statues of the heathen god and the gan emperor defiled the Holy of Holies.[2] The figure of a swine s set over the gate leading to Bethlehem and Hebron.[3]

Nor were the Christians spared. The Christian Church of Jeru- em had until this period been a Jewish congregation governed Jewish pastors, and it was naturally enough considered by the mans to form a portion of the nation : as such, it was treated h the same indignity. The site of the Holy Sepulchre was ered over with earth, and a temple was erected to Venus on the t. The place was thus peculiarly desecrated in the eyes of ristians, whether Jew or Gentile.[4]

OSS OF THE JEWISH TRADITIONS RELATING TO JERUSALEM.

The exertions of the Roman administration to root out Jewish ditions in the city of Jerusalem, were not fruitless. The ristians who settled in Ælia Capitolina were a community of ntiles. With the Jews they had no common bond of feeling, and y had no national character. Perhaps one of the most general timents in their body was an aversion to the rebel Jews and everything Jewish. A converted Gentile, named Mark, was cted bishop of the Christian church of Ælia Capitolina. The ceding bishops of the congregation of Jerusalem had all been by h Jews.[5]

The Roman administration would encourage the neglect of every ctice connected with the reminiscences of the old city, whose

Gemarah Taanieh, c. 4 : "Quando aravit Turanus Rufus impius porticum," etc. monides "in Bartoloc." *Biblioth. Rabb.* iii. p. 679. Hieronymi (Divi) *Comm. in har.* viii. 19.

Dio Cassius, lxix. 12 : Ἐς δὲ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα πόλιν αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς κατασείσης οἰκίσαντος, ἣν καὶ Αἰλίαν Καπιτωλίναν ὠνόμασε, καὶ ἐς τὸν τοῦ ναοῦ θεοῦ τόπον ναὸν τῷ Διὶ ἕτερον ἀντεγείραντος. Hieronymi *Comm. in Esai.* : "Ubi quondam erat templum et religio Dei, ibi Hadriani statua et Jovis idolum catum est." Some of the architectural remains of the Mosque of Omar may date this time.

[3] Eusebius, *Chronicon.*

Eusebius (*Life of Constantine*, iii. 26) mentions the Temple of Venus. Sozomen, *es. Hist.* ii. 1. The name of Hadrian as the founder of the temple is, however, mentioned by later writers.—*Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 73. The practice of rating the sacred edifices of the Pagans was adopted by the Christians at a later d. A church was built at Alexandria to insult the votaries of Mithra on the spot e they had performed their mysteries.—Neander, "Julian," 125.

Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 6.

name it was the wish of the emperor should be buried in oblivio The traditions of Jerusalem and of the Jews, thus powerfu assailed and carefully undermined, soon faded away among a pop lation of Gentiles. It is, therefore, by no means extraordinary th between the year 136, when Hadrian dedicated his colony, and th year 326, when Helena sanctified the site of the Holy Sepulchr all tradition of its exact locality had ceased among the Christia inhabitants of the Roman colony of Ælia Capitolina.

Though it may have been known to the persons connected wi the government of the Church, and with the local administratio that the Temple of Venus marked the site of the Holy Sepulchr the general disgust with which the Christians must have viewed th desecration, led them, without doubt, to neglect the locality. Her then, we have evidence sufficient to warrant the conclusion th during great part of the interval between Hadrian and Constantin or a considerable portion of the space of 190 years, there was a interruption of the general tradition concerning the position of Gc gotha, and the site of the Holy Sepulchre. The name of Golgoth and the place of a skull may have been utterly forgotten by th citizens of Ælia Capitolina, and the tomb of our Saviour ma have been neglected by the new Christian population of the Roma colony.

CONSTANTINE SANCTIFIES THE TOMB OF CHRIST.

Immediately after the first general council of Nice, the emperc Constantine determined to consecrate the site of the Holy Sepulchr and to honour it by erecting a church. Whether he was moved t this undertaking by what he believed to be a divine impulse, b the solicitations of his mother Helena, or by the prayers of som of the bishops at the Council, is not a matter of great moment a evidence of his having selected the true site. The first step of th emperor was to seek for topographical proofs. The temple c Venus had been constructed to desecrate that site. It was de stroyed, and the heaps of earth in which its foundations were raise were cleared away. When the rubbish was removed, and th ancient level of the rock laid bare, the tomb was discovered.[1] Tha tomb is now disfigured with marble ornaments, and visited annuall by thousands of pilgrims, who mark their devotion to Christianit with as much superstition as sincerity.

TESTIMONY OF EUSEBIUS.

Eusebius, the cotemporary historian who speaks of the discovery may be considered an eye-witness of the event. He was Bishop o Cæsarea in Palestine, and a man of piety and learning, thoug a courtier and a flatterer of his patron the Emperor Constantine This ecclesiastical historian gives the discovery of the Holy

[1] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, iii. 28.

pulchre something of a miraculous aspect in his narrative. But relates the facts in so clear a manner that his evidence is of the ost precise and unexceptionable nature. His insinuations that an baptised Christian like Constantine was moved by a divine im- lse, must be connected with the facts that Constantine was nperor of Rome and the protector of Eusebius.[1]

The testimony of Eusebius must, however, be admitted to prove at the discovery was in some degree unexpected by the majority the Christians at Jerusalem, and that all memory of the site was t to the people.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHAPEL OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE BY CONSTANTINE.

After his discovery, the emperor erected a monument adorned h columns over the tomb, and a splendid church in its vicinity, posite, as Eusebius says, to the ancient Jerusalem, which God l allowed to be ruined as a punishment for the impiety of its abitants.[2] The dedication of these buildings took place in the ar 336, ten years after the discovery.

"No one has ever doubted the identity of the present site with t selected by Constantine."[3] But a great deal of discussion has sen concerning the identity of this site with the tomb in which body of our Saviour was laid.

ARGUMENTS OF DR. ROBINSON AGAINST THE PRESENT SITE.

The arguments of Dr. Robinson against the authenticity of the actually shown at Jerusalem as the Holy Sepulchre, go so far to prove that it cannot by any possibility be the true site. The idence adduced in its favour rests, in his opinion, on two grounds, n tradition, and on the inference adopted by the Emperor Con- ntine that the Temple of Venus erected by the pagans over the of the sepulchre was really so placed. Tradition Dr. Robinson misses as a vain and fallacious guide, even if it existed in the e of Constantine; but he infers, from the circumstance that no grimages were then made to the Holy Sepulchre, that there uld be no such tradition. Eusebius, the cotemporary ecclesias- ul historian, whose testimony might be of some value as a proof its existence, is absolutely silent concerning any such tradition. th regard to the temple of Venus, he thinks that the writers who ntion the discovery of the Sepulchre by Constantine, only afford idence that such a temple stood over the spot fixed upon by nstantine as the site of the Holy Sepulchre.

[1] Constantine had probably embraced Christianity in Gaul, A.D. 312.—Godefroy. *Theod.* xvi. x. 1.

[2] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, iii. 33: Ἀντιπρόσωπος τῇ παλαιᾷ ταύτῃ κρυς.

[3] Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 71. This is no longer correct since the ication of Mr. Fergusson's work.

Dr. Robinson, in concluding his arguments, sums up with the fo
lowing words: "I am led irresistibly to the conclusion, that th
Golgotha and the tomb now shown in the Church of the Ho
Sepulchre, are not upon the real places of the crucifixion and resu
rection of our Lord. The alleged discovery of Calvary and th
Sepulchre by the aged and credulous Helena, like her discovery
the cross, may not improbably have been the work of pious frau
It would, perhaps, not be doing injustice to the Bishop Macari
and his clergy, if we regard the whole as a well-laid and successf
plan for restoring to Jerusalem its former consideration, and elev
ting his see to a higher degree of influence and dignity." [1]

So far, however, Dr. Robinson's arguments only raise gre
doubts concerning the probability of the sites now shown being th
actual sites. The truth of his observations concerning the sma
value of tradition, in all historical questions, must be fully admitte
And the fact that there is no direct evidence of the existenc
of any tradition relating to the position of the Holy Sepulchr
except the supposed connection between its site and that of th
Temple of Venus, from the time of Hadrian to that of Constantin
is undeniable.

But Dr. Robinson has gone much farther, and attempted to prov
that the sites now shown cannot by any possibility be the real site
because they are within the line of the ancient walls of Jerusalem
and the places of the crucifixion and interment of our Lord wer
without the gate of the city. But Dr. Robinson has only supporte
this assertion by an opinion of his own concerning the position o
the ancient walls of Jerusalem. He decides the discussion in h
own favour by imagining a line of wall for the city, which woul
include the sites whose identity he assails.

It is not proposed to enter on this subject in the following page
the questions relating to the position of three walls which enclose
Jerusalem at different periods, presenting far greater difficultie
than any relating to the site of the Holy Sepulchre. The auther
ticity of the site assailed by Dr. Robinson, must be proved or dis
proved by direct evidence, and not by any hypothesis concernin
the direction of the city wall in which Titus left the three tower
standing.

ARGUMENTS OF THE REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS IN ITS FAVOUR

The Reverend George Williams, in a learned work on the topo
graphy of Jerusalem, entitled "The Holy City," endeavours t
prove that the sites now shown are authentic. Mr. William
attempts to refute all the arguments of Dr. Robinson. He consider
tradition competent to establish the identity of these sites, and th
existence of the tradition in their favour he holds to be satisfac
torily proved; borrowing from Chateaubriand the argument tha
the regular succession of the Jewish-Christian bishops from th

[1] *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 80

ostle St. James to the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian, and Gentile bishops from the time of Hadrian to that of Constantine, ıst have preserved the memory of these sacred places.

Mr. Williams remarks, "that if any apology be required for empting a defence of the tradition relating to the Holy Sepulchre Jerusalem, it is offered in the consideration, that the credit of whole Church for fifteen hundred years is in some measure inved in the question."[1] But Mr. Williams is too candid to assert t the tradition, even in this case, is conclusive evidence. "It st be admitted, in examining the question, that the nature of the e does not admit of demonstrative proof; the most we can expect a high degree of probability; and, if we can divest ourselves of undue prejudice against traditionary evidence, we shall be ready grant that there is a strong antecedent presumption on the side a tradition which has antiquity and universality in its favour."[2] argues also that the name of Golgotha would be preserved, and nd to preserve the memorial of the site among the natives";[3] l that the Christian Church never having been absent from usalem for more than a few years, the Christians at Jerusalem st always have been able to identify the true site, however accint or design might have altered its character.[4]

The impossibility of any pious fraud having been committed by lena, or sanctioned by the Bishop of Jerusalem, is also strongly isted on. As I have quoted the words in which Dr. Robinson ns up his arguments, I shall do the same with Mr. Williams: he main authority for the present site of the Holy Sepulchre is sebius, and the warrant for its preservation or recovery is the gan temple raised over it by Hadrian, which became a lasting ord of the spot."[5] And since, in the time of this emperor, the cifixion and burial of our Saviour were almost in the memory of n, we may conclude "that this powerful record of the means d by pagans to obliterate the rites of Christianity, seems to ord decisive evidence concerning the locality of the tomb, and to ce its situation beyond the reach of doubt."[6]

Though Mr. Williams seems to think tradition sufficient to satisfy impartial inquirers, he nevertheless enlarges with great care on topographical evidence which can be brought forward in opposin to Dr. Robinson's opinions. But it must be owned that, able some of his topographical observations are, they can no more magnified into direct evidence in favour of the sites now shown n Dr. Robinson's topographical opinions into direct evidence inst them. The truth is, that neither Mr. Williams nor Dr. binson have adduced any conclusive evidence concerning the cise line of the ancient walls of Jerusalem. And, on this ticular point, it is evident that Dr. Robinson has a very great antage in the nature of the question; for, if Dr. Robinson's line

[1] *The Holy City*, p. 253. [2] *Ibid.* 256 [3] *Ibid.* 289. [4] *Ibid.* 290.
Mr. Newman's Preface to Fleury, p. clvi., note *f*, as quoted in *The Holy City* 97.
[5] Dr. Clarke's *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 549, as quoted in *The Holy City*, p. 297.

of wall be the true one, then the present sites cannot possibly authentic, since they are within that wall. But even if Mr. Williams line of wall should really be proved to rest on the firmest foundi tions, still it would be possible that the sites now shown, thoug without that wall, might not be the true sites.[1]

Lord Nugent has also attempted to uphold the evidence of trad tion against the powerful assaults of Dr. Robinson's reasoning Lord Nugent considers tradition peculiarly applicable to this cas What can mankind prove by tradition, if it can be supposed th Christians could forget the site of their Saviour's burial and resu rection? Alas, however, for mankind! Man will forget anythin

The supplementary arguments deduced by Lord Nugent fro the direction of the walls, from the position of the gate Gennat and from his attempt to identify the present bazaar with the sp where the troops of Titus carried the second wall, as recorded Josephus,[3] even supposing they were all conceded, would st hardly be sufficient to frame an issue directly affecting the authe ticity of the present sites that could be sent to a jury. His lordshi topographical arguments, though ingenious, cannot be admitted be direct evidence on the question of the identification of t sites of the crucifixion and resurrection.

In this discussion, Dr. Robinson has certainly the advantage his arguments, though Mr. Williams and Lord Nugent may be rig in their conclusions. It is much easier to find good reasons f doubting than to find evidence strong enough to refute doubt The American divine has also adopted a more correct spirit of i vestigation; but the English clergyman has prosecuted his inqui with better topographical observations, and the man of the wor has displayed a finer and juster discrimination of the results of fac Dr. Robinson studied authorities with care; and these authoritie as he perceived, were far from conclusive. The reverence M Williams resolved to pay to these very authorities made him re satisfied with imperfect evidence. Lord Nugent looked at the si with candour, and, under the guidance of taste and feeling, he f convinced. All three have, however, spoiled their case. Dr. Robi son, by making an untenable hypothesis concerning an imagina wall; and Mr. Williams and Lord Nugent, by allowing this wea ness of their adversary to delude them into indulging in conjectu as a means of refuting conjecture.

[1] In spite of all the learning that has been employed on the subject, and the laborio researches of Dr. Robinson and Mr. Williams, we really know but little concerning t topography of ancient Jerusalem. It is necessary to use great caution in examining t subject under the guidance of modern authors. Though the work of Mr. Williams perhaps the best on the subject, he has too often neglected the canons of archæologic science to be a safe guide. Still, he has added something to our scanty stock of kno ledge, and his identification of the valley Tyropœon is a very important step towar solving many existing difficulties. The best statement of the historical evidence co cerning the ancient walls, is that of Professor Fallmerayer. "Denkschrift über Golgat und das Heilig Grab," 1852, in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Bavaria*.

[2] *Lands Classical and Sacred*.

[3] Josephus, *Jewish War*, book v. ch. 8.

PRESENT STATE OF PUBLIC OPINION CONCERNING THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SITE.

The question now at issue is, where is the true site of the Holy pulchre? It is therefore necessary, in the first place, to examine ether there exists any direct evidence on the subject; for if there none, then the question will be a matter of inference and opinion, d cannot in all probability ever be permanently settled. The esumption that the site now shown is not the real tomb, has be-me of late years so general among Protestants, that the burden the proof in its favour is now thrown, rather unfairly, it must be nfessed, on those who maintain a fact undisputed for about 1500 ars. Undoubtedly, they who first called in question the authen-ity of the actual site, ought to have been compelled to prove that is not the real tomb, before the public condescended to change opinion; but, unfortunately, the doubters have always the ad-ntage in historical discussion; and be it right or wrong now, it evident that if the site shown as the Holy Sepulchre is to be in ure generally admitted to be the tomb of our Saviour, it must proved to be so by historical evidence. Tradition will no longer ve the purpose.

No inferences from the disputed and questionable topography of cient Jerusalem can be admitted. Direct proof must be adduced at Constantine really brought to light the real tomb of Christ, and at the site now reverenced is the one which he sanctified. This ot, though well known after the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus, pears to have been forgotten or neglected after the foundation of lia Capitolina by Hadrian. It must be proved that documentary dence existed for nearly two centuries, while tradition was silent. othing less will satisfy a hesitating world.

EVIDENCE THAT CONSTANTINE FIXED ON THE TRUE SITE.

It is necessary to examine all the evidence which it was in the wer of Constantine to collect in his endeavour to ascertain the e of the Holy Sepulchre, and to scrutinise this evidence with fect impartiality. We may then decide whether the evidence sufficient to establish the truth of a point of history.

Eusebius, as has been already noticed, mentions that the pagans d erected a temple of Venus over the Holy Sepulchre. Tradi-n, it has been supposed, would enable the Christians to preserve ne memory of this circumstance. Dr. Robinson is of a contrary nion. He declares, that "the amount of the testimony relative an idol erected over the place of the resurrection, and serving to rk the spot, is simply that writers, *ex post facto*, have mentioned h an idol as standing, not over the sepulchre known of old as ng that of Christ, but *over the spot fixed upon by Constantine as t sepulchre*."[1]

[1] *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 73.

It becomes, therefore, necessary to show that Constantine h documentary evidence to prove, that the Temple of Venus, or idol which stood over the spot fixed upon by his officers as the s of the Holy Sepulchre, really stood over the sepulchre known old as that of Christ. It is the simplest method of arriving a solution of the question, to adopt the very ground occupied by I Robinson in his *Biblical Researches* as the arena of discussion, a prosecute the search for truth, as far as possible, by his side.

MODE OF INVESTIGATION FOLLOWED BY CONSTANTINE.

What mode of investigation would Constantine adopt, when had resolved to ascertain the site of the Holy Sepulchre? In sp of the reverence many persons display for tradition, I cannot belie that the Roman emperor instructed his officers in Palestine to co mence by an examination of the oldest grave-diggers or notar of Ælia Capitolina. There can be no doubt that, in a case of much importance in the eyes of Constantine himself, and in t opinion of the whole Christian world, the emperor would adopt t usual means afforded by the administration of the Roman emp for ascertaining the truth in any doubtful topographical or territor dispute. In this particular case, as a numerous, powerful, and i telligent body of sceptic and pagan philosophers and statesm would watch every step of the imperial proceedings with suspicio the government would undoubtedly observe strictly the usu official forms.

It is from the very circumstance of Constantine having scrup lously observed these forms of proceeding in order to ascertain t truth, that they are not particularly detailed by the ecclesiastic historians who mention his discovery of the Holy Sepulchre.

PERFECTION OF THE ROMAN CENSUS, AND EXACT REGISTRATION OF PROPERTY.

It is well known that the excellence of the Roman imper government consisted in two things,—in an admirable civil admi istration, and an incomparable judicial organisation. Now, in department of the civil administration was the superiority of t Roman system of Government over that of modern states more co spicuous, than in the mass of statistical information in the possessi of the executive power.

In the time of Vespasian, the political archives of Rome contain 3000 bronze tablets, on which all the public laws, decrees of t senate, and treaties of peace with foreign powers, as well as speci privileges to confederated states or favoured individuals, we engraved. But, besides this splendid collection of public document the national archives contained another collection for the preserv tion of all statistical information connected with the census.[1]

[1] Suetonius, "Vespasian," c. 8.

The census was so perfect, that throughout the wide extent of the man empire every private estate was surveyed. Maps were con-ucted, indicating not only every locality possessing a name, but detailed that every field was measured. And in the register con-cted with the map, even the number of the fruit-trees in the rdens, the olive-trees in the groves, and the vines in the vineyards, as set down, the cattle were counted, and the inhabitants, both ves and free, were individually inscribed in this register.[1]

Not only every Roman province, and especially every Roman lony, but even every municipality, was surveyed with this extreme curacy. A plan of the district was engraved on brass, and depo-ed in the imperial register-office; while copies were placed in e hands of the local administrations, and in the provincial archives. ne fact that these plans were engraved on plates of brass is men-ned by Hyginus, and the practice of multiplying copies of these azen plates on linen is incidentally recorded in the Theodosian le.[2]

APPLICATION OF THE CENSUS TO JUDEA MENTIONED BY ST. LUKE.

Such were the principles on which the Roman census was con-ucted, and these principles were first applied to Judea in the ne of Augustus. St. Luke gives us some interesting information ncerning the manner of framing the personal registers of the nsus. He shows us the minute attention paid by the Roman ad-nistration to all statistical details, and supplies us with the means contrasting the personal importance of each citizen in ancient itical communities with the utter insignificance of the social po-on of a private individual in modern states. The words of the angelist are: "And it came to pass in those days, that there nt out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should taxed. (And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was vernor of Syria.) And all went to be taxed, every one into his n city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city Nazareth, into Judæa, unto the city of David, which is called thlehem (because he was of the house and lineage of David), to taxed."[3]

The Pandects also afford evidence that the inspection over

[1] Ulpian in the Pandects, lib. l. tit. xiv. 4.

[2] Ulpianus, lib. iii. "De Censibus." Forma censuali cavetur, ut agri sic in censum feratur: nomen fundi cujusque, et in qua civitate, et in quo pago sit, et quos duos habeat proximos habeat, et id arvum quod in decem annis proximis satum erit, quot arborum sit, vinea quot vites habeat, olivetum quot jugerum, et quot arbores habeat, pratum, quod intra decem annos proximos factum erit, quot jugerum, pascua quot jugerum esse videantur, item silvæ cæduæ, omnia ipse, qui defert, æstimet. . . . Quare si cujus portio chasmate perierit, debebit per censitorem relevari."

Hyginus, *De Limitibus constituendis*, p. 193, in the collection of the Agrimensores, ited "Rei Agrariæ auctores legesque, variæ quædam nunc primum, cætera emenda-ius prodeunt cura Wilhelmi Goesii, 4to, Amst. 1674."

Cod. Theodos. xi. xxvii.: "Æreis tabulis vel cerussatis aut linteis mappis scripta per ingulas civitates Italiæ proponatur lex," etc.

[3] St. Luke ii. 1–5.

every portion of property was as exact and minute as the cont which was exercised over each individual citizen.[1] And Livy forms us that this administrative organisation was a portion of Roman constitution, and had been applied in all its details to allied cities, and among the Latins, as early as the year B.C. 17

The mass of statistical information collected by the great cen of Augustus, was of such importance, that the emperor himself induced to prepare an abstract of its results, which was presen to the Senate by his successor Tiberius, and regarded as one of most valuable monuments of his government.[3] The registers the census were still farther improved in the reigns of Dioclet and Constantine; and the revision of the taxation based on th registers was established every fifteenth year, as a fundamental l of the empire.

The importance of the general survey and registration of prope over the whole Roman empire has not been sufficiently appreciat by modern historians, nor has its effect on the events of Rom history been fully developed. It is not one of the least of t merits of the sagacious Niebuhr that he was the first to point the great importance of the Agrimensones, or corps of ci engineers; and the necessity of studying their duties in order enlarge our knowledge of the Roman administration. The busine of the Agrimensones was to measure lands and maintain bou daries, and a map of their survey was deposited in the imper archives, while a copy was placed in those of the colony. Duri the decline of the empire, and consequently in the time of Consta tine, they formed a numerous and respectable class. Many them were men both of rank and science.[4]

The name of the Surveyor-general of Augustus, Balbus, h been preserved by history. Frontinus, who mentions it, gives some notices concerning the survey. The limits of the provinc and the boundaries of the municipalities and cities, were determin and recorded in the books of Augustus and Nero; and Balbus, the time of Augustus, compiled a commentary on the forms a admeasurements of the census, in which the condition of land property throughout the empire was registered and explained.[5]

The exactitude of the details in this early survey was so gre that they were applicable to fixing questions relating to priva property; and excited the admiration of posterity as late as t time of Cassiodorus, who cites its minuteness as enabling each pr prietor to know his own rights with certainty, and the amount the public taxes to which he was liable, about the middle of th sixth century.[6]

[1] *Pandects*, book l. tit. xv. 4: "Is vero qui agrum in alia civitate." etc.
[2] Livy, xlii. 10. [3] Tacitus, *Annals*, l. 2. Suetonius, "Augustus," c. 28, 102.
[4] Niebuhr's *Roman History*, vol. ii. p. 634.
[5] *Frontini de Coloniis Libellus*, in the collection to the "Rei Agrariæ Auctor Legesque, ap. Goesium," p. 109.
[6] *Cassiodori Variarum*, lib. xii.; lib. iii. 52: "Augusti si quidem temporibus ord Romanus agris divisus censuque descriptus est, ut possessio sua nulli haberetur i certa quam pro tributorum susceperat quantitate solvenda."

MATERIALS AT CONSTANTINE'S DISPOSAL FOR VERIFYING THE SITE.

The evidence already produced would be sufficient to prove that the Roman Archives, in the time of Constantine, afforded the materials necessary for determining with exactitude the site of any public building in Jerusalem. The particular mention of Ælia Capitolina in the Pandects puts this beyond a doubt. Ulpian there informs us that the two Roman colonies in Palestine, Ælia Capitolina and Cæsarea, did not enjoy the Jus Italicum.[1] Now this proves that they enjoyed every other advantage of the Roman administration. The previous application of the census of Augustus to the citizens of Judea, would require the government of the colony to pay even more than the usual attention to perfect all the details of its survey, and compile comparative maps and plans of the topography of Jerusalem and the new colony. We have, also, precise evidence that the details of the census were most rigorously applied throughout the whole extent of the empire in the reign of Constantine. Lactantius, the tutor of his son, gives a sketch of its minuteness.[2]

When Constantine, therefore, had determined to ascertain the exact site of the tomb of our Saviour, there can be no doubt that he ordered the imperial archives to be searched for plans of Jerusalem, as it existed both before and after its conquest by Titus and Hadrian. Such plans must have existed, not only in the imperial archives, but also in the provincial records of Judea, and in the register-office of the colony of Ælia Capitolina. These plans would leave no doubt that the Temple of Venus stood over the real site of the tomb of our Saviour. Had the smallest doubt remained, it could easily have been removed by actual measurement from some other position. The position of Golgotha, the gate leading to Golgotha, and the property of Joseph of Arimathæa, were all places which must have been inserted in the registers. The words of Eusebius, already quoted, lead us to believe that the Temple of Venus was, even in his time, without the walls. Supposing, however, that not a trace of the walls or of the gate remained, their position could easily be ascertained from the title-deeds of property in the vicinity, inscribed in the register as early as the time of Augustus. With the place called Golgotha, and the tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, a rich man and a counsellor, to search for, both of which must have been laid down in the plans, and inscribed

[1] *Pandects*, l. tit. xv. 1, 6: "In Palæstina duæ sunt coloniæ, Cæsariensis et Ælia Capitolina; sed neutra jus Italicum habet."

[2] *Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 23: "Agri glebatim metiebantur, vites et arbores numerabantur, animalia omnis generis scribebantur, hominum capita notabantur; nec quisque cum liberis, cum servis aderant."

Siculus Flaccus, edit. Goesii, p. 9: "Titulos finitis spatiis positos, qui indicent cujus agri quis dominus, quod spatium tueatur."—*Rei Agrariæ Auctores*.

M. Dureau de la Malle, in his *Economie Politique des Romains*, gives an accurate and critical examination of our knowledge relating to all the details of the Roman census.

in the registers, prior to the time of the crucifixion, any pious fraud of the Christians in the time of Constantine, could only have proved injurious to their own cause.

That the Temple of Venus, consequently, really stood over the site of the Holy Sepulchre, was a fact that could be verified without difficulty, both by Constantine and his officers. That the site was so verified, we may rest assured, otherwise the Jews and Pagans, in the time of Julian, would have pointed out the inaccuracy of the researches of Constantine, and revealed the smallest flaw in the evidence. Any insufficiency in the data on which Constantine had pretended to fix the sites of the crucifixion and the resurrection, as soon as it was adopted by the Christians, would have been considered a legitimate ground for drawing the inference that the Christians had accepted the fundamental truths of their religion on the same imperfect testimony. It would not have been reserved for Korte, a bookseller from Altona, to raise doubts concerning the authenticity of the site; nor for Dr. Robinson, an American divine, to make the charitable discovery that Constantine, or Helena, or the Bishop Macarius, had committed a pious fraud.

ARGUMENTS HITHERTO ADDUCED BOTH AGAINST AND IN FAVOUR OF THE PRESENT SITE NUGATORY.

The arguments of recent writers against and in favour of the authenticity of the actual site have now been proved to be nugatory or irrelevant. Dr. Robinson combats tradition, insinuates fraud, and builds an imaginary wall, when he ought to have searched for historical evidence. Both Lord Nugent and the Rev. George Williams adopt conclusions based only on opinions.

The question of the authenticity of the site now shown, really turns on the probability of the Roman administration having preserved documentary evidence for the space of at most one hundred and ninety years, when we know that at least three copies of this documentary evidence must have existed originally. During all the period, too, between the foundation of Ælia Capitolina and the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre, Palestine enjoyed as great a degree of tranquillity as England since the time of Cromwell. The uniform course of the Roman administration, therefore, renders the preservation of all the statistical documents required for the verification of the sites sought by Constantine, a fact which must be admitted, unless historical evidence can be adduced to prove that their destruction was more probable than their preservation.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NARRATIVE OF EUSEBIUS.

We now see that the account given of the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre by Eusebius, as a cotemporary and an eye-witness, is in the strictest accordance with the official course pursued by Constantine. Eusebius makes no mention of tradition, for he knew

that documentary evidence alone could determine with certainty that the Temple of Venus was erected over the tomb of our Saviour. When the removal of the pagan shrine took place, and the foundations were cleared away, the fact that the sepulchre, hewn in the rock, remained undestroyed, naturally called forth expressions of wonder and pious gratitude. Its destruction would have been so easy to those who covered it up with earth, and desecrated it in the eyes of the Christians, in order to veil it for ever in oblivion, that Eusebius might well consider that it had been spared only by a miracle.

SUMMARY.

The arguments concerning the identity of the site at present shown as the Holy Sepulchre which have been hitherto brought forward in examining the subject, are insufficient either to prove or disprove any disputed point of history. They seem to me to be grounded on unwarranted assumptions, and supported by unfounded suppositions.

I have made an attempt to treat the question as one of historical evidence. Unless I deceive myself, I have succeeded in demonstrating that, far from the site of the Holy Sepulchre being, as it has generally been considered, the most doubtful point in the topography of Jerusalem, it is precisely the point which we are enabled to fix with the greatest certainty. It is the settled base from which all future investigations of the topography of the Holy City must proceed.

It is vain to pretend that any argument can be drawn from the actual appearance of Jerusalem, to render it impossible that the present site should ever have been without the walls. Eusebius never could have committed so preposterous an error concerning the walls of Jerusalem as to suppose it without their limits, had it been included within their circuit ; and the Jews and Pagans in the time of Julian would have loudly proclaimed the blunder.

It appears to me that there are only two points within the walls of Jerusalem which are incontestable,—the site of the Holy Sepulchre, and of the Temple of the Jews. From these two points, and the marked topographical features of Mount Sion and the valley Tyropoion, we must cautiously proceed to the identification of the rest.

Since the discovery of the tomb by Constantine, the buildings erected over it, and the church constructed in its vicinity, have been more than once destroyed.[1] But while the greatest doubt rests on

[1] Jerusalem was taken by the Persians in the year 614, and the church of the Holy Sepulchre was burnt.—*Chronicon Paschale*, p. 385, edit. Paris. It was rebuilt almost immediately. The church was again burnt by the Mohammedans in the reign of Nicephorus II., about 966.—Cedrenus, vol. ii. p. 661. In the year 1010, Hakem, caliph of Egypt, demolished the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and defaced the tomb itself.—Cedrenus, 706; William of Tyre, i. 4. Romanus III. and Michael IV. contributed to its reconstruction.—Cedrenus, 731. It was completed in 1048.—William of Tyre, i. 6. After the Crusaders founded the kingdom of Jerusalem, they erected over,

the lines of the various walls with which Jerusalem has at different times been fortified, none can now exist concerning the authenticity of the site of the Holy Sepulchre, which many rival sects and hostile national churches have ever since agreed in considering as a holy place of pilgrimage.

If history can prove any facts by collateral evidence, it must be admitted that it has proved that Constantine could not possibly have been mistaken in identifying the site of the Holy Sepulchre, and that Christians cannot have transferred the site from the spot fixed on by him in his time.

We may consequently rest perfectly satisfied, that when we view the marble tomb now standing in the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem, we really look on the site of the sepulchre that was hewn in a rock in the place where Jesus was crucified.

IV

CATALOGUE OF THE EDITION OF THE BYZANTINE HISTORIANS PRINTED AT PARIS, AND REPRINTED AT VENICE, WITH THE ADDITIONS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE IT

Copies both of the original edition of the collection of the Byzantine historians, printed at Paris, and of the Venetian reprint vary so much in the arrangement and number of the volumes, that an alphabetical catalogue of the works is necessary in order to enable purchasers to form a complete set of these writers, and may prove useful to students of the history of the Eastern Empire. A list of the Paris edition, as the volumes were first published, or at least as they were arranged in the oldest French catalogues, will be found in Ebert's Bibliographisches Lexicon, and in Schweiger's Handbuch der Classichen Bibliographie, and an alphabetical index of all the works, in the third volume of Pinder's Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur, von Schoell. It is needless to notice the superiority of the new edition, now in the course of publication at Bonn, which is often great. Still the older editions often retain their value, as many works are not entirely reprinted.

and in connection with the sacred places, a stately temple, enclosing the whole of the sacred precincts; the walls and general form of which probably remain to the present day.—Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. p. 61. In the year 1808, the church of the Holy Sepulchre was nearly destroyed by fire, but the tomb escaped uninjured. The repairs of the walls and reconstruction of the church were completed in the year 1810.

As a proof that no change took place in the site at the destruction of the church by the Persians in 614, the Iberians who accompanied Heraclius in his campaigns had been in the habit of making pilgrimages to the Holy Sepulchre, and sending money for the use of the holy places to the Patriarch before the Persian invasion, and they continued to do so after the Mohammedan conquest.—Constantine Porphyr. [illegible] p. 198, edit. Bonn.

1. PH. LABBÆI de Byzantinæ historiæ Scriptoribus emittendis ad omnes per orbem eruditos protrepticon. Parisiis, 1648.

   Excerpta de legationibus ex DEXIPPO Atheniense, EUNAPIO Sardiano, PETRO Patricio, PRISCO Sophista, MALCHO Philadelph., MENANDRO Protect., THEOPHYLACTO Simocatta, a D. Hoeschelio edita. Item Eclogæ historicorum de rebus Byzantinis, quorum integra scripta aut injuria temporum interciderunt, aut plura continent ad Constant. historiam minus spectantia. Selegit interp. recensuit notisque illust. PH. LABBE. Recensio auctorum, qui in hisce eclogis continentur. OLYMPIODORUS Thebæus, CANDIDUS Isaurus, THEOPHANES Byzantius de bello Justini adv. Persas, HESYCHIUS Milesius de rebus patriis Constantinopoleos. Parisiis, 1648.

2. AGATHIÆ Scholastici de imperio et rebus gestis Justiniani, imp. libri V. gr. et lat. interpr. B. Vulcanio, access. ejusd. Agathiæ epigrammata. Parisiis, 1660.

3. ANASTASII Bibliothecarii Historia Ecclesiastica, acced. notæ Car. Annib. Fabroti. Ejusd. Anastasii vitæ Pontificum Romanorum. Parisiis, 1649.

4. COMNENÆ Porphyrog. Cæsarissæ (Annæ) Alexias, lib. xv. a Pet. Passino, lat. interpret glossario et notis illust., accesserunt præfat. ac notæ Dav. Hoeschelii. Parisiis, 1651.

   Notæ historicæ et philol. in Annæ Comnenæ Alexiadem. Parisiis, 1670.

5. and 6. BANDURI (Anselmi) Imperium Orientale, sive Antiquitates Constantinopolitanæ in quatuor partes distributæ. 2 vol. Parisiis, 1711.

   Vol. I. Constantini Porphyro, de Thematibus Orientis et Occidentis liber. Hieroclis Grammatici Synecdemus—Constantini Porphyr. de administrando imperio lib.—Agapeti Diaconi capita admonitoria ad Justinianum imp.—Basilii imp. capita exhortationum ad Leonem filium—Theophylacti Archiep. Bulg. institutio regia ad Constantinum Porphyrog. —Anonymi origines Constantinopolitanæ ac descriptio ædis Sophianæ—Breves demonstrationes chronographicæ incerti auctoris—Nicetæ Choniatæ narratio de statuis Constantinopolitanis, quas Latini, capta urbe, in monetam conflaverunt.

   Vol. II. Ans. Banduri animadversiones in Constantini Porph. libros de thematibus et de adm. imperio ; ac breves notæ ad opuscula Agapeti Diac. Basilii imp. et Theophylacti etc.

7, 8, and 9. CANTACUZENI (Joan.) Historia, gr. et lat. ex interp. J. Pontani, c. ejusdem, et J. Gretseri, annot. 3 vol. Parisiis, 1645.

10. CEDRENI (Georgii) Compendium Historiarum, gr. et lat. ex vers. et c. not. G. Xylandri, Acce. ad not. J. Goar et Car. Annib.

Fabroti glossar, in Cedrenum. Excerpta ex breviario historii Joannis Skylitzæ Curopolatæ. Parisiis, 1647.

11. CHALCOCONDYLÆ (Laonici) Historiar. lib. x. de origine et re gestis Turcorum gr. et lat. cum annalibus Sultanorum ex ve J. Leunclavii. acc. C. A. Fabroti ind. gloss. Chalcocond. Parisi 1650.

12. Chronicon Alexandrinum s. Chronion Paschale a mundo co dito ad Heraclii imp. a. 20. c. n. chron. et hist. cura Car. Dufres Dn. du Cange. Parisiis, 1688.

13. Chronicon Orientale latinitate donatum ab Abrahamo Ecche lensi. Ejusd. Historiæ Orientalis supplementum. Parisiis, 165 Chronicon Orientale Petri Rahebi Ægypti ex Arabico lati reddittum ab Ab. Ecchellensi, nunc nova interpr. donatum J. S. Assemano. Fol. Venet. 1729.

This Venetian edition is improved and augmented.

14. CINNAMI (Joan.) Historiar. libr. vi. gr. et lat. c. not. hist. philol. Car. Dufresne du Cange. acc. Pauli Silentiarii descripti S. Sophiæ. gr. et lat. c. n. Ducange. Parisiis, 1670.

15. CODINI (Georgii) et Anonymi excerpta de antiquitat. Constan tinopolitanis, gr. et lat. ex vers. Petr. Lambecii. c. ejusd. not. ac MANUEL. CHRYSOLARÆ, epist. iii. etc. IMP. LEONIS. oracula (fig.) gr. et lat. interpr. Bern. Medonio. Parisiis, 1655.

16. CODINI (Georgii) De off. magnæ ecclesiæ et aulæ Constantinc politanæ, gr. et lat. ex vers. J. Gretseri c. ejusd. comment. acc notitiæ Græcorum episcopatuum a Leone Sapiente ad Andron cum Palæologum a J. Goar. Parisiis, 1648.

17 and 18. PORPHYROGEN. (Constantini) Lib. ii. De ceremonii aulæ Byzantinæ, gr. et lat. ed. J. H. Leich, et J. Jac. Reiske 2 vol. Lipsiæ, 1751.

19. Corporis Historiæ Byz. nova appendix opera GEORGII PISIDÆ THEODOSII Diaconi, et CORIPPI Africani complectens, c. noti P. F. Foggini. Romæ, 1777.

20. DUCÆ (J.) Historia Byzantina, gr. et lat. not. illustrav. Ism Bullialdi. Parisii, 1649.

21. DUFRESNE D. DUCANGE (Car.) Historia Byzantina duplic commentario illustrata, prior familias ac stemmata imperatorun Constantinopolit. cum eorundem numismatibus; alter descrip tionem urbis Constantinopolitanæ sub imp. Christianis. Parisiis 1680.

22. GENESIUS (Jos.) de reb. Constantinopolitanis, a Leone Armenic ad Basilium Macedonem—Geo. PHRANZÆ, Chronicon lat.—J ANTIOCHENI cog. MALALÆ, Chronographia. R. BENTLEI Epistola ad Millium. LEONIS ALLATII Opuscula. Fol. Venet 1733.

23. ACROPOLITÆ (Georgii) Historia, gr. et lat. JOELIS Chronographia Compendiaria, et J. CANANI Narratio de bello Constantinopolitano, gr. et lat. ex interpr. Leon. Allatii c. ejusd. et Theod. Dousæ observ. acc. Allatii de Georgiis et eorum scriptis diatribæ. Parisiis, 1651.

24. GLYCÆ (Mich.) Annales, gr. et lat. ex vers. J. Leunclavii, ex rec. et c. notis, Ph. Labbæi. Parisiis, 1660.

25. Historiæ Byzantinæ Scriptores post Theophanem. Parisiis, 1685.

Chronici jassu Constantini Porphyrog. conscripti a Leone Armenio usque ad Michaelem Theoph. fil. libri iv. Constantini Porphyrog, Basilius Macedo.—Anonymus continuator Theophanis—Orthodoxorum invectiva adv. Iconomachos.—Joannis Jerosolymitani narratio de Iconomachis—Joannis Cameniatæ narratio de excidio urbis Thessalonicæ—Demetri Cydonii monodia occisorum Thessalonicæ—Symeonis Magistri ac Logothetæ Annales—Georgii Monachii, vitæ recentior. imp. a Leone Armenio usque ad Constantinum Porphyrogen.

26. LEONIS (Diaconi) Historia, scriptoresque ad res Byzantinas pertinentes etc. ed. C. B. Hase. Fol. Parisiis, 1819.

LEONIS Diaconi Caloënsis Historiæ, libri x. et liber de velitatione bellica Nicephori Augusti, e recensione Car. Ben. Hasii, addita ejusdem versione atque adnotationibus ab ipso recognitis. Accedunt Theodosii Acroases de Creta capta e rec. F. Jacobsii et Luitprandi legatio cum aliis libellis qui Nicephori Phocæ et Joannis Tzimiscis historiam illustrant. Bonnæ, 1828.

27. LYDUS (J. F.) De magistratibus Romanis ed. J. D. Fuss, præf. est. C. B. Hase. 8vo. Parisiis, 1811.

De ostentis. Parisiis, 1823.

The works of Lydus are printed in one volume of the Bonn edition. Joannes Lydus, ex. rec. Imm. Bekkeri. 8vo. Bonn, 1837.

28. MALALÆ (Joan) ANTIOCHENI. cognomento J. MALALÆ, Hist. Chronica, ed. Ed. Chilmead. Oxon. 8vo. 1691.

Reprinted at Venice, in No. 24.

29. MANASSIS (Constantini) Breviarium Hist. ex. interpr. J. Leunclavii, c. ejusdem et J. Meursii, not. acc. var. lect. cura Leonis Allatii, et C. Ann. Fabroti, et ejusdem glossarium. Parisiis, 1655.

30. NICETÆ ACOMINATI, Historia, gr. et lat. interpr. Hier. Wolfio, c. ejusd. notis, acc. C. A. Fabroti. glossarium. Parisiis, 1647.

NICETÆ ACOMINATI CHONIATÆ, Narratio de statuis antiquis, quas Franci post captam anno 1204 Constantinopolin destruxerunt. Ex codice Bodleiiano emendatius edita a F. Wilken. Lipsiæ, 1830, 8vo.

31. NICEPHORI Patriarchæ, Breviarium Hist. de reb. gest. ab obi Mauricii ad Constantinum usque Copronymum. gr. et lat. interpr. et notis D. Petavii. Parisiis, 1648.

32. NICEPHORI (Bryenii) Commentarii de rebus Byzantinis gr. lat. stud. P. Possini. Parisiis, 1661.

33 and 34. NICEPHORI (Gregoræ) Byzantina Historia, ex ver Hieron. Wolfii et J. Boivini. 2 vol. Parisiis, 1702.

35. Notitia Dignitatum imperii Romani—ex nova recens. P LABBÆI. Parisiis, 1651, 8vo. Ven. 1732, Fol.

The new edition by Dr. Bœcking is so superior that all earlie ones are useless. 8vo. 2 vols. Bonn, 1839.

36 and 37. PACHYMERIS Georgii) Historia, gr. et lat. cur observat. P. Possini. 2 vol. Fol. Romæ typ. Barberinis, 1666–6

38. POLLUCIS (Jul.) Historia Physica, seu chronicon ab origin mundi usque ad Valentis tempora, nunc primum gr. et lat. editum ab Ign. Hard. Monach. 1792, 8vo.

It was also published under the title, Anonymi Scriptoris hist sacra. Folio. J. B. Bianconi. Bononiæ, 1779.

39. PHRANTZÆ (Georg.) Chronicon, ed. F. C. Alter. Fol. Vindob 1795. Gr.

A new edition of Phrantzas has been published at Bonn, wit the gr. text and lat. translation.

40 and 41. PROCOPII (Cæsariensis) Hist. sui temp. lib. viii. Ejusd de ædificiis Justiniani, lib. vi. gr. et lat. c. n. C. Maltreti. Ejusd Arcana historia, gr. et lat. ex interpr. et c. notis N. Alemanni Parisiis, 1662–3, 2 vol.

42. SYNCELLI Chronographia et NICEPHORI Breviarium chronogr gr. et lat. interpr. et c. n. Jac. Goar. Parisiis, 1652.

43. THEOPHANIS Chronographia, et Leonis Grammatici Vitæ recent. imperator. gr. et lat. ex interpr. J. Goar, et c. ejusd. e F. Combefis not. Parisiis, 1655.

44. THEOPHYLACTI Simocattæ Hist. lib. viii. gr. et lat. ex J. Pon tani interp. Parisiis, 1647.

45. THEOPHYLACTI Institutio regia ad Porphyrogenitum Constan tinum, gr. et lat. interpr. P. Possino. Fol. Venet. 1729.

46 and 47. ZONARÆ (Joan.) Annales. gr. et lat. ex interpr. Hier. Wolfii recens. et not. illustr. C. Dufresne D. Ducange. 2 vol Parisiis, 1686–87.

In order to form a complete set of works on Byzantine history, it is usual to add the following to the library.

48. Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs François, par GEOFFRAY de Ville-Hardouin, avec les notes du C. Dufresne D. Ducange. Paris, 1657.

49. DUFRESNE DN. DUCANGE, (C.) Dissertatio de imperator. Constantinop. numismat. 4to. Rom. 1755.

50 and 51. BANDURI (Ans.) Numismata imperatorum Romanorum a Trajano Decio ad Palæologos. Fol. 2 vol. Parisiis, 1718.

52. TANINII (Hier.) Numismatum imperatorum Romanorum a Bandurio editorum supplementum. Fol. Romæ, 1791.

53, 54, and 55. LEQUIEN, (Mich.) Oriens Christianus. Fol. 3 vol. Parisiis, 1740.

56. BOSCHII (Petri) Tractatus de patriarchis Antiochenis. Fol. Venet. 1748.

57. CUPERI (Gu.) Tractatus de patriarchis Constantinopolitanis. Fol. Venet. 1751.

58. CYPRII (Ph.) Chronicon Eccles. gr. ed. M. Blancard. 4to. Franeg. 1679.

59 and 60. BONGARSII, (Jac.) Gesta Dei per Francos s. et 61. Orientalium expeditionum et regni Francorum Hierosolymitani hist. Fol. 2 vol. Hanov. 1611.

61, 62, and 63. Menologium Græcorum jussu Basilii Imperatoris, Græce et Latine prodit studio et opera Card. Albani. 3 vol. Fol. Urbini. 1727.

INDEX

Abdalmelik pays tribute to Justinian II., 381 ; coinage, 383, 409 ; establishes haratch, 383
Aboubekr, order to army, 367
Achaia, Roman province, 52, 55 ; proconsular government, 124
Achaian league, 26, 80
Acyndinus, prefect, anecdote of, 156
Administration, Roman, civil, 51 *et seq.* ; fiscal, 57, 116, 156, 202 ; justice, 287 ; abuses, 293
Africa, Vandal conquest, 231 ; Justinian's government, 235 ; rebellions, 212, 213, 235, 238 ; Latin the language of, 314 ; Saracen conquest, 363, 374, 377, 386
Agriculture protected by Constantine, 126
Alaric, 164
Albanians, 329 *and note*
Alexander the Great, influence of, 24, 28, 286
Alexandria, 87, 205, 317 ; ceases to be a Greek city, 362
Amorium, 375
Amphictyonic council, 74, 80
Anastasius I., emperor, 185 ; reforms the curia, 186 ; abolishes the chrysargyron, 186 ; compelled to sign a declaration of orthodoxy, 193 ; laid foundation of Justinian's successes, 201
Anastasius II., 389
Antioch, 184, 187, 205, 263 ; ceases to be a Greek city, 394
Antonius, Caius, extortions in Greece, 65, 66 *note*
Apollonius of Tyana, 83
Arabs, 261, 322, 350 ; destroy civilisation, 363 ; conquests, 365 ; build new capitals, 369 ; purchase peace, 373, 379 ; defeated, 387
Areopagus, 47
Arians, opposition to Greeks, 138, 230
Aristocracy, Roman, 102 ; official, 293 ; military, 300 ; influence, 391
Armenia, 260, 323, 372
Armenians, 172, 270, 274
Army, the, 123, 200, 208 ; numbers, 296 ; hostile to court, 300, 302 ; of Heraclius, 343
Art, cause of excellence in, 30, 194 ; works carried to Rome, 84 ; Greek love of, 84 ; Christianity hostile to, 84, 193 ; destruction of works of, 195, 196 ; decay and ruin, 346, 404 *et seq.*
Asemous repulses Attila, 175
Asia Minor, principal seat of Greek population, 324 ; resists Mohammedan progress, 343 ; state of, 397 ; languages, *ib.*
Aspar, 183
Asparuch founds Bulgarian Kingdom, 380
Astacus, gulf, canal to lake Sophon, 186
Astrology, 31, 96, 131
Asylum, right of, 95
Athens, an allied city, 40, 58 ; taken by Sylla, 46 ; prohibited from selling citizenship, 47 *note*, 73 ; population, 80 ; public distributions of grain at, 61 *note*, 149 ; state during decline of paganism, 275 *et seq.* ; Hadrian's works at, 77 ; influence, 80, 86 ; walls repaired by Valerian, 105 ; taken by Goths, 106 ; by Alaric, 164 ; state of, 131 *note*, 149, 179, 206, 228, 275 *et seq.*, 373 ; schools closed by Justinian I., 284 ; Eudocia or Athenaïs, as her life illustrates the condition of society, 180 *et seq.* ; water police at, 224 *note*
Attica, rebellion of slaves, 43 ; depopulation, 69 ; insurrection, 70 ; Attic dialect preserved, 80, 278, 279
Attila, 174, 175, 182
Augustus, policy of, 73
Avars, invade Europe, 258 ; use Scythian letters, 259 *note* ; successes, 291, 294, 296 ; extent of empire of, 299 ; massacre prisoners, 302 ; conclude peace with Phocas, 306 ; in time of Heraclius, 329 ; besiege Constantinople, 331 ; penetrate into Greece, 332 ; plunder Archipelago, 334 ; decline, 413

Banditti, 225, 398 *et seq.*
Basiliskos, usurper, 184
Belisarius, 198, 210 ; guards, *ib. note*, 214, 233, 238, 241, 242, 246 ; receives offer of Western Empire, 242 ; historical fame, 243 ; blindness, *ib.* ; on his blindness, 417 *et seq.* ; wealth, 243, 246 ; defence of Constantinople, 254
Bible translated into eastern languages, 274
Bigotry, 184 *note*
Bœotian league, 80
Bosphorus, Cimmerian, 153, 251
Bosporus, city and kingdom, 153, 251, 347
Brigands, *see* Banditti
Brutus, usurious claim of, 56
Bulgarian Kingdom founded, A.D. 678, 379
Bulgarians, 251, 331, 379
Byblos, independent, 367
Byzantine empire, commencement of, 348, 349
Byzantine historians neglect history of the Greeks, 334 ; Catalogue of their works in editions of Paris and Venice, 456 *et seq.*
Byzantine money, observations on, 419 *et seq.*

Caligula's wish, 60
Caliph's power, 365
Canal, between lake Sophon and gulf of Nicomedia, 186; Nile and Red Sea, 269, 317; filled up, 361
Caracalla, edict of, 77, 78, 79, 81, 88, 118; monetary changes, 422
Carthage, designed capital of empire, 314, 315; taken by Saracens, 363, 374; destroyed, 394
Casilinus, victory of Narses at, 247
Cavalry dismounted in battle, 208 *note*; cataphracti, 210
Celibacy, 70
Census, Roman, accurate application in the provinces, 450 *et seq.*
Centralisation carried too far, 204, 402
Chaldaic Christians, 322
Cherson, or Chersonesos, 152, 153, 251; seat of Asiatic trade, 268, 347; Pope Martin banished to, 371; devastated by Justinian II., 388; state, 392, 394, 414
Chersonesos of Thrace, 252
Chiefs of cities in Roman empire independent, 366
China, 268
Chosroes Nushirvan, 261; destroys Antioch, 263; and Dara, 294; defeated, 294
Christianity, hostile to Rome, 102, 111, 134, 140, 191; saves society, 129, 133, 146; inimical to fine arts, 193, 195; progress, 133, 134; influence on female society, 133; persecuted, 135; adopted by Constantine as an administrative institution, 129; exterminated in Mohammedan provinces, 364; cause of, betrayed by patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria, 357, 359, 367
Chronicon Paschale, 407
Chronology of Greece under the Romans, 13
Chrysargyron, established, 118; abolished, 186
Church, 136, 142; national, 182; orthodox, 193, 272; in Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, 274; not universal, 311, 340; influence, 413
Cibyraïot theme, 387 *note*
Cicero, censure of Roman venality, 44
Citizens and soldiers, separation of these classes in Roman empire, 120, 123
Clergy, prohibited from trading, 126; corrupted by power, 159; national character, 191, 206, 413
Coins, colonial, of Corinth, 72; of Patras, 74 *note*; Greek, of Nicopolis, 75; value of Roman and Byzantine, 419; debased by Justinian, 220
Colchis, 209, 260, 263
Colonies, Roman, in Greece, 72 *et seq.*; of emigration, 99; at Dioscorides, 154; of Goths, by Theodosius I., 161; of Huns, by Justinian I., 253; of Mardaïtes, 382; of Cypriotes, 382; of Sclavonians in Asia Minor, 398; in Cyprus, 383, 395; in Greece, 395
Commerce of Greeks, 28, 36, 81, 85, 126, 154, 172, 264, 312; effect on Greece, 408; state of, 410 *et seq.*, 411 *et seq.*
Commercial laws, 86, 126
Confiscation, source of revenue, 60, 222
Constans II., 369; visits Athens and Rome, 374
Constantine the Great, reforms, 111, 114, 115; fiscal, 116, 118; military, 122; strategos of Athens, 149, 279
Constantine IV., Pogonatus, 375, 379
Constantinople, a Roman city, 112, 127; condition, 128, 146, 314; difficulty of conquest, 175; compared with Carthage, 316; besieged by Avars, 331; by Moawyah for seven years, 377; chronology of operations, 15; taken by Theodosius III., 390
Consulate abolished, 205
Corinth, territory of, ager publicus, 55; population sold as slaves, 67; Roman colony, 72; isthmus fortified, 105; plundered by Alaric, 165
Corippus, 236
Cos plundered, 370
Council of Chalcedon, 182; Latin language employed, 192; sixth general, 380; in Trullo, 384
Crete conquered by Romans, 42, 50; pays tribute to Saracens, 378
Crispus, 324. *See* Priscus
Cross, Holy, restored to Jerusalem, 338, 354; carried to Constantinople, 356
Curia, Roman municipality, 119 *et seq.*
Cyprus, Roman province, 54; burdens of, 63; tributary to Saracens, 367, 370; inhabitants compelled to emigrate, 382
Cyrenaïca, Greeks exterminated in, 363
Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, treats with Mohammedans, 367
Cythera, 73
Cyzicus, station of Saracens, 378

Dacia, 162
Dalmatia, 238; colonised by Sclavonians, 326
Dara taken by Chosroes, 294; restored, 298
Debts, effect of, on society in Greece, 91
Decline of Roman empire attributed to Christianity, 140
Defensor of municipality, 121
Deism, 132
Delphi, 96
Depopulation of Greece, 66, 68, 70, 75; in time of Plutarch, 89; of Roman empire, 294, 387
Despotism pleasing to the people, 397
Dexippus, 105, 106
Diocletian, 111; money, 426
Dioscorides, colony, 154
Discipline of armies relaxed, 211
Distributions of grain, at Rome, 61, 100, 127, 205; introduced by Gracchus, 100; at Athens, 61, 149, 279; at Antioch and Alexandria, 62, 101; abolished at Alexandria, 205; nature of, at Constantinople, 62, 127, 314
Dodona plundered by Totila, 227, 253

Dyme, colony of pirates, 51
Dyrrachium, or Epidamnus, 176, 312

Earthquakes, 150, 184, 187, 226, 227
Ecclesiastical literature, 191
Ecthesis, 340, 370
Egnatia via, 312
Egypt, 40, 60, 99, 125; decline of, 269, 392; conquered by Persians, 318; by Arabs, 359; population and revenues, 360
Egyptians, 172
Eleusis, temple, rebuilt by Marcus Aurelius, 79; burned by Alaric, 165
Emperors, civil and military position, 200; foreigners, 400 *note*
Empire, separation, 154, 170 *et seq.*; policy of Eastern, 177; relations with Persia, 260; on eve of dissolution, 287; extent, 392
Ephesus, temple, destroyed, 106
Epidamnus, *see* Dyrrachium
Ethiopia, converted to Christianity, 154; fleet, 264; alliance with empire, 294
Eudocia, wife of Arcadius, attacked by Chrysostom, 196
Eudocia, or Athenaïs, wife of Theodosius II., biography, 180 *et seq.*
Eutychians, 193, 273, 311, 341
Evagrius, 304, 407

Fallmerayer on the extinction of the Greek race, 332
Famine, 226; in Italy, 242
Fine arts, 30, 82, 83; Theodosius II., painter, 178; decline, 193, 195; state of monuments, 404
Firmus, rebellion in Egypt, 125
Fiscal administration, 57; of Constantine, 116; of Justinian, 199, 203; fiscal obligations opposed to military service, 207
Fleets, 148, 173, 183, 233; in Red Sea, 264
Follis, sum of money, 127 *note*; coin, 425
Foreign commanders in Roman armies, 214, 300 *note*
Foreign emperors, 392, 401
Franks, 242; defeated by Narses, 247

George Pisida, 406
Gelimer, 231, 233
Generic, at Tænarus, 176; defeats expedition of Leo I., 183; conquers Africa, 230
Gepids, 209, 249, 290
Germanos, patriarch, 376
Ghassan, Arab kingdom, 261, 322
Gibbon, authority questioned, 92, 107; corrected by Naudet, 123 *note*; treats the story of Eudocia's apple with contempt, 181
Goths, 103, 104, 161; colonies, 162; Ostrogoths in Italy, 236, 247; list of kings, 244 *note*; Visigoths in Spain, 248; Tetraxits, 249
Greece, population, 35, 66, 68, 75, 88; conquered by Romans, 37; condition, 41, 70, 75, 79, 81, 88 *et seq.*, 90, 91, 148, 190, 205, 223, 226, 344, 398; plundered by pirates, 47; by Roman officials, 67 *et seq.*; of works of art, 84 *et seq.*; Romans jealous of Greek institutions, 76, 80 *note*; favoured by Hadrian, 76; ravaged by Goths, 105, 164, 166, 176, 226, 253; by Huns, 226, 252; by Sclavonians, 332; by Avars, 332; misfortunes, 226; earthquakes, *ib.*; place of banishment, 414; its history assumes a new character with Leo III., 392
Greek character, as viewed by Romans, 81, 82
Greek church formed, 136; national characteristic, 191, 273, 401; separates from Latin, 371, 384
Greek cities retain privileges under Roman empire, 41, 43, 52, 80, 88, 205; revive, 346, 403 *et seq.*; Roman municipal system introduced, 119 *et seq.*
Greek local militia abolished by Justinian, 212
Greeks, decline of their national influence, 27; moral defects of society, 32 *et seq.*; contrast with Romans, 32; population, 34 *et seq.*; despair of liberty, 40; state at Roman conquest, 41; retain laws, 52, 54, 56; at Rome, 81; remain ignorant of Roman literature, 83; condition, 97, 124, 151, 154; decline, 125, 151, 190, 205, 395; repulse Goths, 108; influence controlled by Constantine's reforms, 124; by other circumstances, 171 *et seq.*; converted to Christianity, 133, 135; organise the Christian church, 111; orthodox, 138, 143, 144, 273; attached to government of Eastern Empire, 212; sailors, not soldiers, *ib.*; animosity against foreigners, 274; despised by Byzantines, 346; in danger of extermination, 394; of southern Italy, 397
Gregory I., Pope, 297, 335 *note*
Guards of Belisarius, 210 *note*; of Justinian, 254

Hadrian reforms administration, 76; improvements in Greece, 77
Haratch established, 383
Heathens in Greece, 346
Hellas, 346
Helladikoi, 346
Heraclius, exarch of Africa, 307, 308
Heraclius, emperor, 308; policy of, 309 *et seq.*; proposes to emigrate to Carthage as his capital, 314, 316; settles Servian and Sclavonian colonies in Dalmatia, 326; escapes from Avars, 330; character, 335, 342; campaigns in Persia, 337; chronology of, 17; religious views, 340; promulgates ecthesis, 340; loses Syria, 343, 356; arrests the progress of Mohammedans in Asia Minor, 343
Heraclius Constantine, emperor, called sometimes Heraclius II., and sometimes Constantine III., 356, 369
Hereditary succession in Roman empire, 288

Heresy, national as well as doctrinal, 273 *et seq.*
Hermits and monks, 122 *note*
Herodes Atticus, 79, 92
Heruls, 209, 249
Hira, Arab kingdom, 261, 322
Holy sepulchre church burned, A.D. 614, 17, 319; restored by Heraclius, 339: on the site of, 438
Humanity, 401
Huns ravage Asia Minor, 168, 174, 226, 249, 251; Kutugur, 253; Utugur, 257; Ephthalite, 259; Kutugur defeated by Belisarius, 257

Iberia, 260
Illyria ravaged by Sclavonians, 253
Imperial household, 126
Indian trade, 154, 173, 265, 312
Indictio, 59, 117
Infantry, Roman, 240
Invasions of empire, Gothic, 104, 161, 174; Justinian's reign, 252 *et seq.*; Persian, 262, 305, 336
Isaurians, 172, 184, 392, 399
Italy, 290, 313, 393, 397

Jacobites, 311, 317 *note*, 341
Jerusalem taken by Persians, 319; Holy cross restored, 339; carried to Constantinople, 343
Jews, numbers, 35 *note*; commerce, 266, 269; persecuted, 306, 311, 320
John, the patrician, 236; the almsgiver, 317
Jornandes, 238 *note*
Julian the apostate, 96; anecdote, 131; policy, 139, 279
Justice, absence of, guarantee for, in despotisms, 189; in Roman empire, 402
Justin I., 187
Justin II., 289; election of, 290
Justinian I., reign, 197; character, 201, 227; confiscates municipal revenues in Greece, 205; revenues of schools of Athens, 275; suppresses local militia, 212; legislation, 215; defects of, 218; conquests, 229, 230; losses, 252, 262; system of defence, 211; purchases peace, 263; neglects military establishments, 254; civil administration, 224; venality, 225; heretical, 273; observation on his coinage, 431
Justinian II., called Rhinotmetus, 380, 386; expatriates the Mardaïtes, 381; plants colonies, 382, 383; buildings, 384 *et seq.*; banished to Cherson, 386; cruelty, 388

Kairowan, 377
Khaled, anecdote of, 366
Khazars, 338

Lacedæmon, 150
Laconian confederacy, 73
Land-tax, 117, 221, 222; in Africa, 235
Languages spoken in Asia Minor, 397; of Thrace, 125, 329
Latin church, 341
Latin language in East, 217
Law, influence, 158, 159, 402; ought to be more powerful than the individual at the head of the executive, 189; great principle of legal administration which renders the law of England superior to that of Rome, 217 *note*
Leo I., the elder, 183; strengthens native army, *ib.*; expense of his expedition against Genseric, *ib. note*
Leo III., the Isaurian, 390, 392
Leontius, 381; emperor, 386; dethroned, 388; death, *ib.*
Lex regia, 288
Literature, Greek, 29 *et seq.*; cause of excellence, 30; state of, 193 *et seq.*, 271 *et seq.*; ecclesiastical, 192; at Rome, 81; decline, 153, 408; local, 394
Lollianus, professor and strategos at Athens, 277
Lombards, 249; conquer northern Italy, 291
Lycaonians, 397

Macedonia, taxes reduced by Romans, 39; four districts, 52, 55; Roman province, 52
Mahomet, born and educated at a period of national excitement, 322; national and religious unity, 341; character, 352; creed, 353; political views, 364
Malalas, 407
Mani, 353
Manufactories, imperial, 127
Marcian, emperor, 182
Mardaïtes, 367, 379; expelled from Syria, 381
Martin, pope, banished to Cherson, 371
Martyrs, 137
Maurice, emperor, character, 296; reduced taxation, 297 *note*; weakness, 299; reforms, 298, 300; peace with Avars, 301; death, 303; work on military tactics, 298 *note*
Megara, 68, 187 *note*
Melchites, 317 *note*
Menander, historian, 406
Mercenaries, 209, 235
Metellus conquers Crete in defiance of Pompey, 50
Milan sacked by Goths, 241
Miliaresion, or Miliarensis, Roman and Byzantine silver coin, 301 *note*, 419 *et seq.*, *passim*
Military affairs, system of Constantine, 120; of Justinian, 207; in East, 170; forces of empire, 206, 211; service opposed to fiscal obligations, 121, 123, 207; music, 213
Mines, 90
Mithridatic war, 45, 66
Moawyah, 372, 373, 377
Mohammedans invade Syria, 355; chronology of campaigns, 19; invade Egypt, 359; Cyrenaica, 363; Africa, *ib.*, 374; destroy Greek civilisation, 362; Christian races die out under their dominion, 364; political system, 366, 367 *et seq.*

Mokaukas, 318, 359
Money, 126; rare in Greece, 222; circulation, 265; sums paid as ransom for cities, 370 *note*; observations on Roman and Byzantine, with tables, 419
Monks, 301 *note*; 404
Monopolies, 411
Monothelites, 340
Moors encroach on Roman population, 232, 236
Municipal institutions, 56, 72, 73, 79; Roman, introduced in Greece, 72, 73, 119 *et seq.*; reformed by Anastasius, 186; under Justinian, 204, 205, 224
Music, military, 213

Naples taken by Belisarius, 238
Narses, 211, 241; commander-in-chief, 247; character, *ib.*; accused of inviting Lombards, 291; death, 292
National feelings in Roman empire, 147, 273
Naval expeditions, Leo I., 183; Belisarius, 233; Moawyah, 372
Nero carries off 500 statues from Delphi, 85
Nerocrates, or head of water police of Athens, 224 *note*
Nicomedia, canal near, 186
Nicopolis, in Epirus, 74
Nika sedition, 219
Nisibis, 298
Nobility in Roman Empire, 220

Obolos, Byzantine copper coin, 434 *et seq.*, *passim*
Ockley, history of the Saracens, 365 *note*
Olympic games suppressed, 282
...r, caliph, 357; enters Jerusalem, 368
...les, 95
...odox church, 142; identified with ...ek nationality, 143, 145, 187, 273, ...
...goths, 231, empire of, 238; list of ...gs, 244 *note*

...nism, decline, 95, 129, 132, 144; con...vative at Rome, 137; cause of ruin, ...6, 158; laws concerning, 184 *note*, ...30; in Greece, 414
...lantium, in Arcadia, 78
...almyra, kingdom of, 125
Patras, Roman colony, 73
Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, 137; of Constantinople, 306, 371
Pausanias' account of Greece, 75, 405
Persecution, 273, 354
Persian empire, 262, 293 *et seq.*; peace with Maurice, 298; war with Phocas, 305; conquests in Roman empire, 262, 318, 319, 336
Pestilence, 226
Philippicus, emperor, 388
Philosophy, influence of, 96, 99; schools at Athens, 275
Phocas, emperor, 302, 305 *et seq.*; murdered, 307
Piracy in Greece and Cilicia, 48; cities and temples plundered, 49; under emperors, 51; revived by Goths, 105
Piræus, 148
Police, 225
Polybius, unfavourable to Greeks, 32; praise of Romans, 43
Pompey commands against pirates, 49; settles pirates at Soli, *ib.*; at Dyme, 51
Pope, bishop of Rome, excites jealousy of pagan emperors, 135; fortunately did not arrogate gift of tongues, 192; excommunicates patriarch of Constantinople, 371
Population of Roman empire, 35; of Greece, *ib.*; Jews, *ib. note*; decline of 88; of Egypt, 367. *See* Depopulation
Posts, 224, 409
Potomarch, head of rural water-police at Athens, 224 *note*
Precious metals thrown into circulation, 31; rise in value, 89; proportion in value, 173; accumulation, 187. *See* On Roman and Byzantine money, 419
Prefectures after time of Constantine, 124
Priscus, 300, 302, 324
Præresius, 280
Proconsuls, 54 *et seq.*
Procopius, 206, 213, 228 *note*, 242
Property, accumulation in hands of individuals, 65, 75, 89
Proprietors in Roman municipality, 120; could not become soldiers, 123; numbers of wealthy, diminish, 203; ruined by land-tax, 222
Ptolemies, 27, 30
Public distributions of grain, *see* Distributions
Pulcheria, Augusta, 178; patronises Eudocia, 180; marries Marcian, 182; policy, *ib.*

Ragusa, 328
Ravenna, siege by Belisarius, 242; sacked by Justinian II., 388
Ravenna, exarchate of, 393
Rebellions, 183, 212
Red sea, 173; canal to Nile, 361
Reforms of Constantine, 113; of Justinian, 201; of Tiberius, II., 295; of Maurice, 302
Religion of Greece, 33, 94, 130, 158, 414
Renegades, 184 *note*
Revenue officers, extortion of, 156
Rhodes, 43, 47; colossus, destroyed by Saracens, 370
Roads, improved by Hadrian, 78, 224
Robbers, 69
Rome, expenditure at, 60; distributions of grain, 61; sieges of, 239, 240, 244; walls, 239; visited by Constans II., 374
Rome, bishop of, 135, 192
Roman administration, 32, 39, 41, 43, 121; colonies in Greece, 72, 73; terminates with Leo III., 390
Roman citizenship universal by Caracalla's edict, 77
Roman empire, indications of a reform in, 111; empire of West, ruined, 171;

frontier in East, 261; prophecy that Eastern Empire should be destroyed by a circumcised people, 321; East transformed into Byzantine empire, 348, 390, 391
Roman knights, farmers of revenue, 65
Romans escape taxation in provinces, 64; eighty thousand put to death in Asia Minor, 66; cut off their thumbs to escape military service, 104
Rufinus, 163, 164
Ruins, disappear in Greece, 149

Samaritans, extinction, 295
Sanctuary, or asylum, right of, abused, 95
Saracens, 261, 342; converted to Mohammedanism, 354; conquer Syria, 335, etc.; besiege Constantinople, 377
Sardinia, 235, 393
Saxons invade Italy with Lombards, 291 *note*
Scævola, as proconsul, allows Greeks the use of their own laws, 56
Scamars, banditti, 398
Scholarians, guards of imperial palace, 254
Sclavonians, 250, 252, 253, 312; settled in Illyria and Dalmatia, 326; colonise Greece, 332, 333, 334, 395; settled in Opsicium, 383; desert Justinian II., *ib.*; in Bulgaria, 379; in Cyprus, 383
Seditions, Nika, 219; other, 220
Seleucia possessed a municipal constitution under the Parthian emperors, 25 *note*
Seleucidæ, 26, 30
Senate of Rome destroyed, 205, 246; of Constantinople, 289; solicits peace from Persia, 336
Sepulchre, on the site of the Holy, 438
Serapis, 96, 130 *note*
Serbs or Servian Sclavonians, 326
Serfs, agricultural, 120, 160, 204, 396; excluded from army, 208 *note*
Shopkeepers, 127
Sicily, condition as a Roman province, 52; conquered by Belisarius, 238; attacked by Saracens, 393
Silk trade, 263, 267; worms introduced in Europe, 268
Sinai, fortress on, 261
Slavery, free citizens reduced to, 43; steps towards its abolition, 160, 198, 203, 223
Slaves, 28; rebellions in Sicily and Attica, 43; slave-trade at Delos, 51; condition, 101, 108, 160, 203; admitted into army, 208 *note*; condition, 396, 411
Society, Greek and Roman, 86; declining, 93, 190; improving, 191, 286; rendered stationary by Roman legislation, 120
Solidus, gold coin of Eastern Empire, 426 *et seq.*, *passim*
Sophon, canal of lake, 186
Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, submits to Mohammedans, 358
Spain, conquests of Justinian, 248; Roman possessions lost, 321 *et seq.*
Sparta, allied city, 40, 58, 205
Statues, 84, 196, 405
Stilicho, 163, 164, 166
Strabo, description of Greece by, 75
Strategos of Athens, 149, 279
Subsidies paid by Roman empire to barbarians, 174, 210
Suez canal, 269, 317, 361
Sylla at Athens, 45; plunders Parthenon, 46; Delos, Delphi, and Olympia, 47; ruins Thebes, *ib.*
Synesius, 159; at Athens, 276
Syracuse, 377
Syria, 172, 319; ravaged by Chosroes, 294; state, 319; conquered by Mohammedans, 356 *et seq.*; chronology of campaigns, 19; towns make separate treaties, 357; chiefs aspire at independence, 321

Tænarus, 176
Tagina, victory of Narses at, 247
Taxes, 52, 57, 59; farmed by Roman knights, 65; land-tax, 59, 117, 186, 207, 221, 327; freemen sold to pay, 160; irregular, 63; Nero remits those of Greece, 64
Tetraxit Goths, 249
Thebes ruined by Sylla, 47; repulses Alaric, 164
Theodore, brother of Heraclius, defeats Persians, 338; defeated by Saracens, 356
Theodore, pope, excommunicates patriarch, 371
Theodoric, 175, 176; empire of, 236 *et seq.*
Theodosius I., the Great, 144, 161; establishes Gothic colonies in Asia Minor, 161
Theodosius II., 178; circumscribes public instruction, 282
Theodosian Code, 179
Theodosius III., 390
Theodosius, brother of Constans II., murdered, 373
Theophylactus Simocatta, 297, 305 *notes*, 406
Thermopylæ, local guard of, 212
Thessalonica, 176, 312, 345
Thrace, language of, 125 *note*; population represented by Vallachians, 329; resisted Greek civilisation, 344
Tiberius II., 290, 294, 295; forms a corps of slaves, 297
Tiberius III., Apsimar, 387, 388
Toleration, 141, 401
Tombs, plundered at Corinth, 73; by Christians, 195
Totila or Baduila, 244; takes Rome, 245; spares it, 246; retakes it, *ib.*; ravages Epirus, 253; death, 247
Treasures, 31, 58, 60; of Anastasius, 187, 189; of Amrou, 363 *note*
Treaties with Saracens, A.D. 659, 373; A.D. 678, 379; A.D. 686, 381
Tributaries in Roman municipality, 120
Trinity of emperors demanded, 376
Troad, plundered by Goths, 166

Turks, 258; commerce at Constantinople, 267, 294; power, 350
Type of Constans II., 370
Tzans, 260

Unity of God, 132, 340, 353
University of Constantinople, 179, 194, 271

Vahan defeated, 356 *et seq.*
Valens slain, 161
Vandals conquer Africa, 230; conquered, 234; list of kings, 233 *note*
Vartan, 356 *et seq.*
Venality of Justinian's administration, 225
Venice, 393
Visigoths, 231, 248, 313
Vitalian, usurper, 185

Wall, great, of Anastasius, 186, 213, 254, 330
Walls at Thracian Chersonesus, Pallene, Thermopylæ, and Isthmus of Corinth, 213; built by Justinian, 224; of towns, destroyed by Vandals, 231; by Saracens, 368; of Rome, 239
Wealth of East, 34; of Greek temples, 49; of individuals, 65, 89; diminution of, 150
Witiges, 239; besieges Rome, 240; surrenders to Belisarius, 242

Zabergan, King of Huns, 213, 253
Zeno, 184; forms native troops, 185; remodels scholarians, 255
Zenobia, 125
Zevgaria, or capita, of land, 222 *note*

PLYMOUTH
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PRINTERS